E. Michael Jones

JEWISH NAZIS

WXP 052208 (FILE) 11/2/65 WASHINGTON: Dan Burroe, grand dragon of the New York Ku Klux Klan (center) is shown in this photo, taken 5/22/61, when he was a member of the American Nazi Party. At left is George Lincoln Rockwell, head of the Nazi Party. Burroe shot himself to death 10/31/65 in Reading, Pa., after reading a newspaper story revealing his Jewish origin. UPI TELEPHOTO rm

E. Michael Jones

JEWISH NAZIS

WXP 052208 (FILE) 11/2/65 WASHINGTON: Dan Burros, grand dragon of the New York Ku Klux Klan (center) is shown in this photo, taken 5/22/61, when he was a member of the American Nazi Party. At left is George Lincoln Rockwell, head of the Nazi Party. Burros shot himself to death 10/31/65 in Reading, Pa., after reading a newspaper story revealing his Jewish origin. UPI TELEPHOTO rkm

Jewish Nazis

By E. Michael Jones

Fidelity Press
206 Marquette Avenue
South Bend, IN 46617

Copyright 2011

To Ruth

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE
The Death of Multiculturalism?
Jewish Mass Murderers
Pro-Life Jew
The Believer
Judaism is Nihilistic
Jewish Nihilism in Nineteenth Century Russia
Obvious Presence
Enlightenment Led to Nihilism
David Cooper
Survival of the Fittest
Georg Ratzinger
Proud of His Great Uncle
The Emancipation of the Jews
Especially Prophetic
Not Impressed
Biographical Note
Footnotes

PREFACE

Seven years after Baruch Goldstein murdered 29 Palestinians in the cave of the patriarch in Hebron, and less than 5 years after Shahak and Mezvinsky explained how Goldstein was a Jewish Nazi, *The Believer*, a film written and directed by Henry Bean about an orthodox Jew who becomes a neo-Nazi won the Grand Jury Prize at the 2001 Sundance film festival. The film is based loosely on the life of Daniel Burros, a neo-Nazi who committed suicide in the mid-'60s after a *New York Times* reporter wrote an article exposing him as a Jew. According to Bean:

> Burros was staying at a camp in the Poconos with the neo-Nazis when the story in the *New York Times* claiming that he was Jewish came out. The Nazis weren't upset. They were saying just sit down; we can talk about this. But Burros went up to his room, put on a Wagner record and shot himself. He killed himself within an hour of the story coming out.

Bean began discussing the Danny Burros story in the '70s when he was a writer living on the West Coast. He began to see Burros as typifying a particular kind of Jew. "He was a rabbi manque. Antisemitism is a form of practicing Judaism. He's sort of a rabbi after all. A Jew by day, a Nazi by night. . . . He was desperately hiding something and compulsively trying to bring it out at the same time. People are drawn to contradiction. He undergoes a conversion, but not back to the Torah." By telling the story of the Jewish Nazi, Bean concluded, "I began to understand what Judaism was."

When Danny Balint, the character Bean created out of the story of Danny Burros, gets a call from a *New York Times* reporter, he gives an eloquent articulation of anti-Semitism. Judaism "is a sickness. . . . The real Jew is a nomad and a wanderer. He has no roots and no attachments. He universalizes everything. All he can do is buy and sell and manipulate markets. It's all mental. Marx, Freud, Einstein: what have they given us? Communism, infantile sexuality and the atom bomb. They want nothing but nothingness, nothing without end."

The main issue in *The Believer* is theological. Danny has penetrated to the heart of the Jewish religion by understanding that the Jew worships Nothingness. If Hitler is the biggest Nihilist of the 20th century, he is the chief rabbi in the religion that worships "nothing but nothingness, nothing without end." He attained that position by default when the Church stopped working for the conversion of the Jews.

The Death of Multiculturalism?

Dorothy Rabinowitz recently announced the death of multiculturalism in the *Wall Street Journal*. Citing the pronouncements of the prime ministers of England, France, and Germany, she crowed:

> Who would have believed that in the space of a few weeks the leaders of the three major European powers would publicly denounce multiculturalism and declare in so many words that it was a proven disaster and a threat to society?

Rabinowitz claimed that multiculturalism had "led to segregated communities"; it had also "helped nurture radical Islam's terrorist cells." Rabinowitz goes on to claim that multiculturalism, which she describes as "the unofficial established religion of the universities," is, in fact, "a faith whose requirements have shaped every aspect of cultural, economic and political life in Western democracies for the last 50 years."[1]

Twenty years ago Rabinowitz was worried about Pat Buchanan and Joe Sobran. Twenty years ago she was writing to the editors of papers like the *Philadelphia Inquirer* demanding that that paper drop Joe Sobran as one of its columnists. Now she's worried about Major Hasan. For those of you who have trouble keeping mass murderers straight in your mind, in November 2009 Major Nidal Malik Hasan opened fire in Fort Hood killing 12 fellow soldiers and wounding 32 others. Rabinowitz attributes this attack to a combination of "Hasan's well-documented jihadist sympathies" and multiculturalism. She ends her piece by claiming that when Major Hasan goes on trial, "The forces of multiculturalist piety, which played so central a role in advancing this Army major and concealing the menace he posed, will be the invisible presence on trial with him."

Associating multiculturalism with Islam is a daring rhetorical move, especially when that rhetorical move is made by a Jew, because Dorothy Rabinowitz must know, even if the dumb *goyim* who read her columns in the *Wall Street Journal* do not, that multiculturalism has been a completely Jewish creation from start to finish. For over 100 years now, Jews in America have been promoting multiculturalism as a strategy for weakening the dominant culture and thereby enhancing Jewish power.

In his essay "Jewish Involvement in Shaping American Immigration policy, 1881-1965: A Historical Review"[2] University of California at Long Beach Professor Kevin MacDonald shows in exhaustive detail how Jewish

organizations supported multiculturalism almost from the moment when eastern European Jews arrived in significant numbers on these shores. According to MacDonald, the "historical record supports the proposition that making the US into a multicultural society has been a major goal of organized Jewry beginning in the 19th century." The main way in which Jews promoted multiculturalism is by changing this nation's immigration laws. "Jews," according to MacDonald, "have been 'the single most persistent pressure group favoring a liberal immigration policy' in the US in the entire immigration debate beginning in 1881." MacDonald goes on to cite one Jewish authority after another to back up his case. According to Neuringer:

> Immigration had constituted a prime object of concern for practically every major Jewish defense and community relations organization. Over the years their spokesmen had assiduously attended congressional hearings and the Jewish effort was of the utmost importance in establishing and financing such nonsectarian groups as the National Liberal Immigration League and the Citizens Committee for Displaced Persons.

According to Nathan C. Belth:

> In Congress, through all the years when the immigration battles were being fought, the names of Jewish legislators were in the forefront of the liberal forces: from Adolph Sabath to Samuel Dickstein and Emanuel Celler in the House and from Herbert H. Lehman to Jacob Javits in the Senate. Each in this time was leader of the ADL and of major organizations concerned with democratic development.

Indeed, writing in 1914, the sociologist Edward A. Ross had a clear sense that liberal immigration policy was exclusively a Jewish issue.

The Jewish promotion of multiculturalism in America had two main goals: 1) "maximizing the number of Jewish immigrants" and 2) "opening up the US to immigration from all of the peoples of the world." Both goals paradoxically used "diversity" as a stalking horse to advance Jewish ethnocentrism. This is so because the whole point of multiculturalism is not so much the promotion of diversity as it is the demographic dilution of homogeneity. Jews wanted to weaken the majority culture because they always felt uncomfortable in unified coherent cultures. The defenders of immigration restriction during this period made it clear that America was a country which had been settled and was then inhabited by Christians from northwestern Europe. This implied racial superiority in the minds of the Jewish proponents of restrictionism but not the legislators, who claimed that

> the northern European, and particularly Anglo-Saxons, made this country. . . . It is a good country. It suits us. And what we assert is that we are not going to surrender it to somebody else or allow other people, no matter what their merits, to make it something different." Representative Leavitt saw through the diversity ploy when he complained that the Jews were "the one great historic people who have maintained the identity of their race throughout centuries because they believe sincerely that they are a chosen people, with certain ideals to maintain, and knowing that the loss of racial identity means a change of ideals.

The restrictionists complained that the Jews were attempting to shape U.S. immigration policy according to Jewish interests and not in the interests of the country which welcomed them as immigrants:

> Hence the endeavor of the Jews to control the immigration policy of the United States. . . . The systematic campaign in newspapers to break down all arguments for restriction and to claim nativist fears is waged by and for one race. Hebrew money is behind the National Liberal Immigration League and its numerous publications. . . . literature that proves the blessings of immigration to all classes in America emanates from subtle Hebrew brains.

The reference to "subtle Hebrew brains" probably excludes Dorothy Rabinowitz from our discussion, but the purpose of multiculturalism has remained constant, as has the Jewish support for it. The purpose of multiculturalism has always been to subvert coherent cultures, weaken the majority, and thereby enhance the Jews' power. Or, as MacDonald puts it,

> ethnic and religious pluralism serves external Jewish interest because Jews become just one of many ethnic groups. This results in the diffusion of political and cultural influence among the various ethnic and religious groups, and it becomes difficult or impossible to develop unified, cohesive groups of gentiles united in their opposition to Judaism. Historically, major anti-Semitic movements have tended to erupt in societies that have been, apart from the Jews, religiously and/or ethnically homogeneous.

The restrictionists included organized labor, who feared competition from the new immigrants who were a perennial source of cheap labor.

"During this period, the immigration issue was also economic. Native businesses feared cutthroat Jewish business practices." Jewish factory owners, the group most likely to be the backers of Jewish organizations favored immigration as a source of cheap labor. During this period [1914] Edward A.

Ross described gentile resentment for "being obliged to engage in a humiliating and undignified scramble to keep his trade or his clients against the Jewish invader—suggesting a rather broad-based concern with Jewish economic competition."

The early opponents of multiculturalism also feared Jews as agents of cultural subversion:

> Our whole system of amusements has been taken over by men who came here on the crest of the south and east European immigration. They produce our horrible film stories; they compose and dish out to us our jazz music, they write many of the books we read, and edit our magazines and newspapers.

Jewish immigrants were also "widely perceived to be . . . disproportionately involved in radical political movements," a fact often acknowledged by the Jewish press. In one of its editorials, *The American Hebrew* pointed out that "we must not forget the immigrants form Russia and Austria will becoming from countries infested with Bolshevism, and it will require more than a superficial effort to make good citizens out of them."

The fact that Jewish immigrants form Eastern Europe were viewed as "infected with Bolshevism . . . unpatriotic, alien, unassimilable" resulted in a wave of anti-Semitism in the 1920s and contributed to the restrictive immigration legislation of the period. Almost a decade after the immigration debate ended with the triumph of the restrictionists in 1924, Jewish immigration was still having consequences for American identity. As MacDonald points out, "In Philadelphia in the 1930s, fully 72.2 percent of the Communist Party members were the children of Jewish immigrants who came to the US in the late 19th and early 20th century."

During the 1920s, Franz Boas, the Prussian Jewish anthropology professor from Columbia University, turned the social sciences into a form of ethnic warfare. Arguments from anthropology, no matter how absurd, could then be marshaled as "scientific" refutation of restrictionist immigration policies:

> Carl Degler notes that Boas's professional correspondence "reveals that an important motive behind his famous head-measuring project in 1910 was his strong personal interest in keeping America diverse in population." The study, whose conclusions were placed into the Congressional Record by Representative Emanuel Celler during the debate on immigration restriction . . . concluded that the environmental difference consequent to immigration caused differences in head shape.

The Battle over multiculturalism continued unabated after World War II. Senator Pat McCarran, a Catholic from Arizona, was subjected to psychoanalysis on the pages of Commentary magazine, published by the American Jewish Committee, as a way of explaining his opposition to the progressive Jewish view on immigration. As before the war, the opposition to McCarran's bill—which became the McCarran-Walter act—"was led by Jewish members of Congress, including Celler, Javits and Lehman, all of whom . . . were prominent members of the ADL."

There is a direct link between Jewish anthropology as practiced by Franz Boas during the 1920s and Jewish immigration policy as implemented by Senator Jacob Javits in 1965. In other words, if New York City resembles Mogadishu these days, we have Dorothy Rabinowitz and her co-religionists to thank for this. The main reason people like Major Hasan are American citizens and serving in the United States Army is the immigration bill of 1965, which was a Jewish operation from start to finish. It turns out that the Jewish organizations that promoted multiculturalism all shared the view of America proposed by Philip Roth in his recent paranoid fantasy novel *The Plot against America*. America, in spite of waging war on Hitler's Third Reich, was always in Jewish eyes a country waiting to be taken over by Nazi extremists. Multiculturalism was the Jewish way of ensuring that that would not happen. As MacDonald points out:

> Earl Raab . . . remarks very positively on the success of revised American foreign policy in altering the ethnic composition of the United States since 1965. Raab notes that the Jewish community has taken a leadership role in changing the Northwestern European bias of American immigration policy, and he has also maintained that one fact inhibiting anti-Semitism in the contemporary US is "an increasing ethnic heterogeneity as a result of immigration, has made it even more difficult for a political party or mass movement of bigotry to develop." Or more colorfully: "The Census Bureau has just reported that about half of the American population will soon be non-white or non-European. And they will all be American citizens. We have tipped beyond the point where a Nazi-Aryan party will be able to prevail in this country." . . . Indeed the "primary objective" of Jewish political activity after 1945 "was . . . to prevent the emergence of an anti-Semitic reactionary mass movement in the United States."

Charles Silberman notes that

> American Jews are committed to cultural tolerance because of their belief that Jews are safe only in a society acceptant of a wide range of

attitudes and behaviors, as well as a diversity of religious and ethnic groups. It is this belief, for example, not approval of homosexuality, that leads an overwhelming majority of American Jews to endorse 'gay rights' and to take a liberal stand on most other so-called 'social' issues.

Silberman's testimony leads MacDonald to conclude that:

> The 1965 law is having the effect that it seems reasonable to suppose had been intended by its Jewish advocates all along: the Census Bureau projects that by the year 2050, European-derived peoples with no longer be a majority of the population of America. Moreover, multiculturalism has already become a powerful ideological and political reality.

In promoting their multicultural agenda, the Jews claimed that it would lead to collaboration and brotherhood. Writers like Boas protégé Israel Ehrenberg, who wrote under the name of Ashley Montagu, claimed that human beings were "innately cooperative." Any evidence that increasing ethnic diversity led to ethnic conflict, i.e., violence, was ignored by the Boasian social science establishment, which had an a priori and overriding commitment to Jewish universalism. Conflict and violence, however, were inevitable, especially since the dominant philosophy of post-Christian America was then and is now Capitalism, which is the economic version of the war of all against all:

> If one adopts a cultural pluralism model in which there is free competition for resources and reproductive success, difference between ethnic groups are inevitable, and history suggests that such differences would result in animosity from the groups that are losing out. . . . Under present policies, each racial/ethnic group in the world is encouraged to press its interest in expanding its demographic and political presence in America and can be expected to do so if given the opportunity.

According to MacDonald, the American Jewish Committee, the main proponent of both multiculturalism and unrestricted immigration, succeeded in changing the ethnic make up of the United States by a combination of "strong leadership [particularly Louis Marshall], internal cohesion, well-funded programs, sophisticated lobbying techniques, well-chosen non-Jewish allies and good timing."

If timing is everything the timing was all wrong in Rabinowitz's attack on the connection between Major Hasan, Islam and multiculturalism. One the one hand, Islam was changing the political face of the Middle East through non-violent, pro-democracy rallies. Egypt had just toppled its dictator in a bloodless revolution. (Paradoxically, the same pro-democracy forces that neocons like

Rabinowitz had promoted as agents of change in the Middle East were finally having their day, and the neocons were upset being pro-democracy in the Middle East means invariably being anti-Israel.) On the other hand, at the very moment when the Islamic world was becoming a paradigm of non-violent democratic revolution of the sort that the neocons all claimed they desired in the mid-East, Americans were treated to a spate of mass murders perpetrated by Jews.

That you may not have noticed this is not surprising. Ever since the Leo Frank trial in America, the Dreyfus case in France, and the Mendil Beilis case in Russia, the Jewish-dominated press has adopted a policy of 1) suppressing the evidence whenever a suspect in a crime turns out to be a Jew and 2) accusing anyone who brings up this fact of anti-Semitism. In addition to that, the Jewish dominated media work for the exoneration of any Jew brought to trial. The pattern had already been established in the 19th century. Once Jews gained significant control over the press, they instituted a policy which suppressed the identification of Jews as criminals, or as a fallback position, once the Jewishness of the perpetrator was inescapable, of proclaiming the suspect as an innocent victim of anti-Semitism. The trial of Leo Frank is a good case in point, and it has served as a template for the Jewish press ever since. As one writer put it in 1892:

> It is a strange phenomenon which otherwise is evident in no other religious group that the Jewish public opinion in the Austrian press always shows solidarity with Jewish criminals. Every time a Jew is convicted of a crime, it is take as new proof for pervasive anti-Semitism. Every conviction is evidence of anti-Semitism.[3]

Jewish Mass Murderers

Dorothy Rabinowitz could have bolstered her case against multiculturalism if she had cited the story of Maksim Gellman. One week before her article appeared in the *Wall Street Journal*, Maksim Gelman, a recent Ukrainian immigrant, who became an American citizen in 2005, went on a two-day killing spree from February 11 to February 12, 2011, which resulted in the stabbing deaths of four people, including his girlfriend's mother, and the wounding of five others. The only problem in this scenario, at least from Rabinowitz's point of view, is that Gelman is a Jew. He was certainly a product of Jewish-inspired multiculturalism which opened this country's borders in 1965, but it is unlikely that he was inspired by jihadism, especially since his father drove an ambulance for a Jewish organization. If Rabinowitz were interested in understanding the psychology of mass murderers, she should have focused on the Jews because it was they who were making the news as mass murderers in early 2011, not the Muslims.

The story of Jared Loughner is another case in point. Roughly one month before Maksim Gelman's homocidal rampage in New York, on January 8, 2011, Loughner went on a shooting spree that resulted in the death of six people and left 14 wounded. One of the people whom Loughner shot but did not kill was United States Representative Gabrielle Giffords, who is Jewish. The response to the killings was both predictable and immediate. Loughner was accused of being a right-wing anti-Semite whose actions had been set in motion by right-wing talk radio and politicians like Sara Palin, whose website featured a picture of Giffords in the cross hairs of a gun sight. The hate crime story circulated widely until the facts started to emerge. Loughner, it turns out, was a Jew himself. In fact, according to some reports, he was a member of the same synagogue that Giffords attended. To make matters more complicated, his favorite book was *Mein Kampf*. Loughner was, in other words, a Jewish Nazi. According to the Jewish Telegraph Agency:

> Bryce Tierney, a friend of Loughner from high school, told Mother Jones magazine that the alleged gunman posted "Mein Kampf" as a "favorite book" on a social media site in part to provoke his mother, who Tierney says is Jewish.

Once it became apparent that Loughner was Jewish, and once it had become clear that it was going to be impossible to maintain the right-wing, anti-Semite story line, the story began to change. The ADL then released an "analysis

of the messages written by Arizona shooting suspect Jared Lee Loughner" which "revealed Wednesday that the he may not have been motivated by anti-Semitism when shooting Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords, but rather by a profound mistrust of government."

"While there is still much we don't know about Loughner, his online footprint offers one window into his mindset in the months leading up to the killings," said Abraham H. Foxman, ADL National Director. "The writings that have come to light so far suggest someone who probably was not associated with any extremist group or movement, but who has a generic distrust of government and a vague interest in conspiracy theories."

In other words, the ADL was telling us that the fact that *Mein Kampf* was Loughner's favorite book had nothing to do with his attempted assassination of a Jewish member of Congress. The only way this makes sense is if we look at the already mentioned pattern of Jewish organizations and newspapers, who exonerate automatically any suspect who happens to be Jewish. But even granting that, it's probably just as accurate to say that the concept of a Jewish Nazi is simply too difficult for the media to process.

The historic precedent of Jewish Nazis assassinating Jewish politicians, however, has already been established, no matter how alien it seems to 21st American media categories. Anton Graf von Arco auf Valley was a Jewish Nazi in the most literal sense of the term. In February 1919, he assassinated Kurt Eisner, the Jewish premier of the Bavarian soviet republic. Arco Valley had served in the German army during World War I and upon his return to civilian life in Munich he was appalled at what he saw as the Jewish influence which took over German culture in the wake of their defeat. Some speculate that he decided to kill Eisner to prove himself to his nationalist friends in the Thule Society, but the mystery remains. Why would a Jew other than Groucho Marx want to be part of an organization that would not accept him as a member? Politics may have had something to do with it. Arco Valley is reported to have said that "Eisner is a Bolshevist, a Jew; he isn't German; he doesn't feel German; he subverts all patriotic thoughts and feelings. He is a traitor to this land."[4] Once Arco Valley killed Eisner, the students at the university which he was attending proclaimed him a hero. Hitler was grateful to his Jewish supporter because Eisner's death led to the creation of the Bavarian Soviet Republic, under another Jew, Eugen Levine, and this convinced groups like the Bavarian Freikorps that things had gone too far and caused them to intervene and put an end to the Communist, i.e, Jewish takeover of Bavaria. Arco Valley was sentenced to death for his crime, but a sympathetic judge overturned the ruling

and commuted it to a five-year prison sentence. Four years into his sentence, he was evicted from his cell to make room for Adolf Hitler, who wrote *Mein Kampf* during his stay there.

Jewish mass murderers remain invisible in America in the 21st century because the concept of the hate crime was created with a political purpose in mind. Murder as already a crime in every state in the union; hate crimes were created to demonize a certain group of people. As a result, the hate crime went on to become a self-fulfilling prophecy because it is only applied when the perpetrator fits a certain profile. As the late Tom Herron pointed out in these pages, the Jew who deliberately set fire to the church of the little flower in Royal Oak, Michigan as retaliation against Father Coughlin, could not be construed as the perpetrator of a hate crime because he was Jewish.

Needless to say, the Rabinowitz theory that mass murders came about when jihadism mixed with multiculturalism was looking less plausible by the minute. On February 10, 2010, which is to say one year before Rabinowitz discovered the key to mass murder in a combination of jihadism and multiculturalism, a white professor walked into a faculty meeting of the biology department at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and murdered the African-American department chairman and other persons of color in the department. This would seem to constitute the quintessential hate crime. That's how the media would have played the story had they not discovered that the mass murderer in this instance turned out to be a woman and Jewish. Once those facts were established, the story, deprived of its political usefulness, disappeared from the headlines.

Amy Bishop, the Jewish lady who gunned down her black department chairman, had murdered her brother a few years earlier but had never been prosecuted because her parents were both wealthy and members of powerful Jewish organizations. Once it becomes apparent that a mass murderer is Jewish the story changes dramatically. Suddenly, we are out of the realm of hate crime and into the realm of dynamic silence, or back to the '60s therapy explanation of why basically good people do bad things when under stress because they have not been granted tenure, etc.

Pro-Life Jew

Just as the recently deceased Bernard Nathanson found that he ceased to exist as a person in the public record when the became a Jew who opposed abortion (there is not such thing as a pro-life Jew according to the categories of the *New York Times*) so there is no such thing as a Jewish Nazi or a Jewish mass murderer. The category simply doesn't exist.

Unless, of course, you read Israel Shahak's account of Baruch Goldstein, yet another Jewish mass murderer, and how he murdered 29 men, including children, at the Patriarch's cave in Hebron on February 25, 1994. Goldstein was born into an Orthodox Jewish family from Brooklyn, where he attended the Yeshivah of Flatbush, Yeshiva University and Albert Einstein College of Medicine. One of Goldstein's boyhood friends was Rabbi Meir Kahane, founder of the Jewish Defense League, and so it came as no surprise when Goldstein joined that organization.

Goldstein emigrated to Israel in 1983 and served as a physician in the Israeli Defense Force, where he refused to treat Arabs, even if they were members of the IDF. The IDF ignored his disobedience of a direct order and sheltered him instead of punishing him until the day he died at the hands of the Palestinians he had failed to kill in his attack.

According to the Wikipedia entry under his name, "Goldstein was immediately denounced with shocked horror even by the mainstream Orthodox,' and most in Israel classified Goldstein as insane." Israel Shakak tells a different story in his book *Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel*, which documents Goldstein's apotheosis as a Jewish saint, complete with monument and pilgrimages to his gravesite. The canonization procedures started at Goldstein's funeral when Rabbi Yaacov Perrin announced that the lives of one million Arabs were "not worth a single Jewish fingernail." Goldstein had become a Jewish saint because he was a Jewish mass murderer:

> While the government seemed determined to play down the magnitude of the massacre, the Jewish masses had turned Goldstein into a saint. . . . In 2010, Jewish settlers were criticized that during celebrations of Purim they sang songs praising Baruch Goldstein's massacre demonstratively in front of their Arab neighbours. A phrase from the song reads "Dr. Goldstein, there is none other like you in the world. Dr. Goldstein, we all love you … he aimed at terrorists' heads, squeezed the trigger hard, and shot bullets, and shot, and shot."

According to Shahak, "Goldstein's behavior had deep roots in the Jewish religion, and that religion had a profound influence on political culture in Israel." The main connection between Goldstein's act of mass murder and the Jewish religion lay in the halachic teaching that "the killing by a Jew of a non-Jew under any circumstances is not regarded as murder." Hence, in the ensuing discussion, "the terms 'murder," "massacre" or "killing" were avoided; instead the terms used were "deed," "event" or "occurrence.'"

The fact that "at least 50 percent of Israeli Jews" approved of the massacre led Katz to claim that "the most obvious conclusion" is that "we, the Jews . . . have been programmed by the same racist computer program that is shaping the majority of the world's nations."

Katz's mention of Jewish racism then led to a discussion of Jewish Nazism. Goldstein was a Jewish Nazi because, unlike Christians who believed in conversion of the Jews, he, like Hitler and Goebbels, believed in exterminating his enemies because of ineradicable racial characteristics. The esteemed Israeli journalist Teddy Preus made Jewish-Nazi connection in article which appeared in *Davar* on March 4, 1994:

> Compared to the giant-scale mass murderers of Auschwitz, Goldstein was certainly a petty murderer. His recorded statements and those of his comrades, however, prove that they were perfectly willing to exterminate at least two million Palestinians at an opportune moment. This makes Dr. Goldstein comparable to Dr. Mengele; the same holds true for anyone saying that he [or she] would welcome more of such Purim holiday celebrations. [The massacre occurred on that holiday.] Let us not devalue Goldstein by comparing him with an inquisitor or a Muslim Jihad fighter. Whenever an infidel was ready to convert to either Christianity or Islam, an inquisitor or Muslim Jihad fighter would, as a rule, spare his life. Goldstein and his admirers are not interested in converting Arabs to Judaism. As their statements abundantly testify, they see the Arabs as nothing more than disease-spreading rats, lice or other loathsome creatures; this is exactly how the Nazis believed that the Aryan race alone had laudable qualities that were inheritable but that could become polluted by sheer contact with dirty and morbid Jews. [JDL founder Meir] Kahane, who learned nothing from the Nuremberg Laws, had exactly the same notions about the Arabs.

Shahak and Mershinzky conclude their book with a condemnation of "those who are silent and do not condemn Jewish Nazism, as exemplified by the ideologies of Goldstein and Ginsburgh, especially if they are Jews, [because they] are guilty of the terrible consequences that may yet develop as a result of

their silence."

The Believer

Seven years after Baruch Goldstein murdered 29 Palestinians in the cave of the patriarch in Hebron, and less than 5 years after Shahak and Merzinsky explained how Goldstein was a Jewish Nazi, *The Believer*, a film written and directed by Henry Bean about an orthodox Jew who becomes a neo-Nazi won the Grand Jury Prize at the 2001 Sundance film festival. The film is based loosely on the life of Daniel Burros, a neo-Nazi who committed suicide in the mid-'60s after a *New York Times* reporter wrote an article exposing him as a Jew. According to Bean:

> Burros was staying at a camp in the Poconos with the neo-Nazis when the story in the *New York Times* claiming that he was Jewish came out. The Nazis weren't upset. They were saying just sit down; we can talk about this. But Burros went up to his room, put on a Wagner record and shot himself. He killed himself within an hour of the story coming out.

Bean began discussing the Danny Burros story in the '70s when he was a writer living on the West Coast. He began to see Burros as typifying a particular kind of Jew. "He was a rabbi manque. Antisemitism is a form of practicing Judaism. He's sort of a rabbi after all. A Jew by day, a Nazi by night. . . . He was desperately hiding something and compulsively trying to bring it out at the same time.

People are drawn to contradiction. He undergoes a conversion, but not back to the Torah." By telling the story of the Jewish Nazi, Bean concluded, "I began to understand what Judaism was."

Bean's explanation of how a Jew can become a Nazi is at root theological. Through a series of flashbacks, the viewer sees Danny Balint, as he is called in the movie, arguing with his Yeshiva teacher about whether Abraham spared Isaac's life, as recounted in the Genesis account, or whether, as Danny maintains, he died on Mt. Moriah. Danny's problems with religion stem from the fact that he takes the Torah much more seriously and literally than his fellow Yeshiva *bokkers*. When one of them tells Danny that "Fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," he becomes rhapsodic: "Fear of the Lord," he responds, "makes you afraid of everything. Do you even believe in God? I'm the only one who does believe. I see Him for the power-drunk madman that he is. And we're supposed to worship such a deity? I say never."

At this point the teacher tells one of the students "to ask Rabbi Singer remove Danny from my class," something which prompts Danny to turn his eyes

upward and say to God, "Then let Him destroy me now. Let Him destroy me like the conceited bully that He is. Go ahead."

Like Jared Loughner, Danny Balint is a Jew who has read *Mein Kampf* and thinks it's a great book. "Did you ever read *Mein Kampf*?" Danny asks his fellow skinheads when they end up in jail after a fight with two blacks. "Hitler had some of his best ideas in prison." Danny admires Hitler, especially his views on race. In the middle of a meeting of more moderate right-wingers at an upscale Manhattan apartment, Danny, who is wearing a red T-shirt emblazoned with a black swastika, interrupts the speaker to opine that "race is central to everything we're talking about tonight. Race is the source of religion." When the speaker objects that this would mean "Germany all over again." Danny responds by saying, "Isn't that what we want? Germany all over again but done right this time?"

When Danny gets a call from a *New York Times* reporter, he gives an eloquent articulation of anti-Semitism. Judaism "is a sickness. . . . The real Jew is a nomad and a wanderer. He has no roots and no attachments. He universalizes everything. All he can do is buy and sell and manipulate markets. It's all mental. Marx, Freud, Einstein: what have they given us? Communism, infantile sexuality and the atom bomb. They want nothing but nothingness, nothing without end."

The main issue in *The Believer* is theological. Danny has penetrated to the heart of the Jewish religion by understanding that the Jew worships Nothingness. As he says to the *Times* reporter, the Jews "want nothing but nothingness, nothing without end."

The *Times* reporter is impressed, but as we have come to expect from reporters, at the moment when the real issue is framed, the reporter changes the subject. "Wow," he tells Danny, "You're incredibly articulate, but how can you believe all this when you're a Jew yourself?"

When confronted by the contradiction at the heart of his identity, Danny becomes violent. At first he denies he's Jewish, then he threatens to sue the *Times* if the reporter publishes the article: "It's reckless disregard. I'm going to sue your fucking Jew paper." Finally, he takes out a gun and puts it into the mouth of the reporter and announces, as if unaware of the contradiction: "If you publish that article, I will kill myself."

All of the themes we have been discussing—Jews, racism, Nazism, nihilism, and violence—are all present in this powerful scene. At this point, they begin to coalesce into a coherent picture. The Jewish Nazi is a political terrorist, but he is, first of all, a Nazi, which is to say a particular kind of socialist. Jews were drawn to socialism and communism throughout the 19th century. In fact

Jews made up the backbone of those movements. Jews were drawn to those movements because they provided both an antidote and a way to give political expression to the Jewish nihilism which came into being when the Enlightenment arrived in the *shtetl* and destroyed rabbinic Judaism. Deprived of a coherent worldview, the Jew still had a sense of himself as a member of the chosen race which could now only find expression in revolutionary violence. The best way for the *shtetl* Jew to bring about *tikkun olan* was *via* dynamite and the Colt revolver.

Because Danny lives in an age in which socialism has failed, he is unsure of how to focus the revolutionary violence that is going to deliver him from the strong pull toward non-being which Jewish nihilism creates. Should he kill the reporter from the Jew newspaper or should he kill himself? Actually, the question needs to be reframed in light of what Danny actually said, namely, "If you publish that article, I will kill myself." Should Danny the Nazi kill Danny the Jew? In a fantasy he picked up after hearing a holocaust survivor describe how a Nazi soldier killed his son, Danny plays the role of both Jew and Nazi soldier.

Judaism is Nihilistic

Judaism, according to the theology proposed by *The Believer*, is essentially nihilistic. The Jews "want nothing but nothingness, nothing without end." This theme gets developed throughout the film. When Danny's girlfriend asks him to explain the difference between God's apophatic character and "Him not existing at all," Danny replies, "there is no difference." When she tells him that "Christianity's silly but at least there's something to believe in," Danny responds by saying, "Judaism is nothing. Nothing but nothingness." Then as if reconsidering the issue, Danny says, "Judaism isn't really about belief. It's about doing things."

"And belief follows?" his girlfriend asks.

"Nothing follows."

Eventually his girlfriend catches on. After setting out a seder meal for Danny, she says he should sit down and take part in the meal because God "commands it whether he exists or not."

Like Jacob, Danny's girlfriend concludes that there is no point in fighting God. "We can fight Him and be crushed. Or we can submit."

"And be crushed," says Danny.

After their rejection of Christ, the Jews confected a religion which is based on the absence of Logos, which is to say, the absence of Being, which is to say, nothing. If the Eucharist in the tabernacle in the Catholic Church can be termed "the real presence," then what the Jew who rejected Christ worships in his synagogue can be termed "the real absence," which is another word for nothing. The Jew worships nothing; or better, the Jew worships nothingness. The Jew, as Jacques Derrida has pointed out malgre lui but amply in his deconstructive literary criticism, is obsessed with the absence of presence or the presence of absence.

Nihilism leads inevitably to violence because violence, which is a manifestation of the arbitrary and autonomous will, is the only way that the acting person can assert his existence in a world without Logos. Violence is an extreme form of self-assertion, and only extreme forms of assertion are powerful enough to prevent the slide into non-being to which the Jewish nihilist is exposed by the very fact that he is Jewish. That is so because Jews worship the absence of being and as a result "want nothing but nothingness, nothing without end." Judaism is about doing things because nihilism is ultimately about doing things, because action is the only thing that prevents dissolution into non-being

in a universe based on nothingness.

Nihilism, in other words, leads inevitably to violence. So to get back to the plot of *The Believer*, when Danny goes to a Jewish bookstore, he meets one of his former Yeshiva classmates, who invites him to the synagogue for services--the same synagogue, it turns out, where Danny planted a bomb, which failed to go off. This time he plants another bomb, timed to go off during Sabbath services, at which he decides to read the Torah. When Danny goes to the synagogue, he meets one of his former Yeshiva classmates, who calls him a "Jewish Nazi." By showing up to davin at the synagogue where he has planted a bomb, Danny the Nazi finally succeeds in killing Danny the Jew. But since he dies reciting the Torah, it is equally accurate to say the Danny the Jew ends up killing Danny the Nazi.

At the end of the film, after Danny blows up the synagogue in which he is praying, we next see him running up a flight of stairs at the Yeshiva. At the top of one flight, Danny sees his former teacher, who now agrees with Danny, claiming now that "Isaac died on Mt. Moriah and was reborn in the world to come," but Danny runs past him up yet another flight of steps, causing the teacher to ask, "Danny, where are you going. Don't you know? There's nothing up there."

Jewish nihilism, in other words, leads to Jewish violence.

Jewish Nihilism in Nineteenth Century Russia

Russia was plagued by nihilism and the violence which it inevitably spawned throughout the course of the 19th century. This was nowhere more evident than in the Jewish *shtetls* which dotted the Pale of the Settlement which made up Russia's predominantly Jewish border with the West during the 19th and early 20th centuries. After centuries of rabbinic despotism, Jewish nihilism became too obvious to ignore about when the German Enlightenment came in contact with the Talmudic culture of the *shtetl* and destroyed it by showing its futility and intellectual obsolescence. The *shtetl* Jew was released from his bondage to the rabbis and the kahal, the Jewish courts which enforced Talmudic nihilist culture, but without being granted access to the Logos which made Christian Europe and hence the Enlightenment (by way of reaction, of course) possible. Using the Enlightenment to split the Talmudic atom released enormous amounts of destructive energy, energy which eventually destroyed Russia itself in 1917.

In his magisterial treatment of Jews and revolution in 19th century Russia, Erich Haberer claims that "Nihilism was the most spontaneous and radical expression of the Russian renascence of the 1860s. Essentially, it was a 'cultural revolution' of the young generation against the existing order":[5]

> Convinced that their native culture was an anachronism that was kept alive by an equally anarchistic surrounding society, these men were rebels without firm social and/or national moorings in either the Jewish or Russian world. They were strangers who, like all men cast adrift on a turbulent sea, sought security by boarding and helping to navigate any ship which would sail into the sunrise. The only vessel that came into sight and took them aboard as full members of the crew, sailed under the flag of revolution. Here they found brotherhood, recognition, and a place they could call their own; here they regained a sense of identity, of belonging and fulfillment, that they had sought desperately in so far as they ceased to identify with their Jewishness. Cut off from their original sources of Jewish existence, they planted - or rather replanted - themselves firmly on the deck of this life-saving vessel which promised a safe, albeit stormy, journey to the promised land. Succinctly put, their cosmopolitanism was really the obverse side of Jewishness - a search for identity that was predicated on their estrangement from the community in which they were raised and which had shaped their spiritual being. Hence the religious-existential

nature of their identification with socialism and its Russian 'church' - the revolutionary movement.

If the Enlightenment could overturn a Logos-based culture like Catholic France in a matter of decades, it is not difficult to imagine the devastating effect that it would have on a fragile anti-Logos culture like the Talmudic *shtetl*. We are still experiencing the fall out from the explosion that destroyed the *shtetl*. *The Believer*, as well as the phenomenon of the Jewish Nazi which it describes, is part of that ongoing cultural fall out.

Nihilism in Russia, including the writings of Nikolai Chernyshevksy, "the Russian 'philosophe' par excellence," was based on the French Enlightenment. As in France, the Haskalah or Jewish Enlightenment called for "the destruction of all authority" and "the ridiculing of all res sacrae."[6] If the 1860s in Russia were a preview of what the 1960s were going to be in the West, it was largely because of Chernyshevsky's novel What is to Be Done? The Tales of the New People (Lenin later appropriated the title *Shto Delat?* for his famous revolutionary pamphlet.) The main characters of the novel, Vera Pavlovna and Pavel Rahkmetov became role models for the youth of the 1860s by espousing free love and a primitive vaguely religious sounding communism.

If the past century and a half has shown anything, it has shown how vulnerable the Logos-based west has been to the weaponizing of sexuality and the secularization of the Gospel that people like Chernyshevsky were proposing. If Catholicism in the West, strengthened by Scholasticism's appropriation of Greek philosophy in the Middle Ages proved to be no match for the Enlightenment, then it's not difficult to see that an essentially xenophobic anti-intellectual Russian orthodoxy was going to fail even more spectaculary. Similarly, if the weaponizing of sexuality and the secularization of the Gospel that people like Chernyshevsky were proposing devastated the West for the next century and a half, they were going to have an even more devastating effect on the culture of the shtetl, which had no Logos to defend itself. The result of this obliteration of shtetl culture was nihilism, or as Haberer puts it, "As a Philosophy of emancipation Russian nihilism can be viewed as an extension of the Jewish Enlightement: it reinforced and radicalized its ideals of secular learning, self-improvement, and social responsibility."[7]

Nihilism took over the '60s generation in the *shtetl* even more rapidly and completely than it took over the mind of the Jews' Russian counterparts because the Logos of an anti-intellectual Christianity provided more resistance that anti-Logos of the Talmud.

Nihilism had served them well in their maskilic, individualistic desire to

emancipate themselves from their religious-traditionalist bound Jewish society. But it had left them frustrated, isolated, and marginal in trying to transform themselves and the Jewish people into universal citizens in the image of modern European culture. In socialism, regardless of its Populist form, they discovered a philosophy of social action which was concerned with, the collective rather than the individual, the 'emotional' rather than the 'rational', and 'the people' rather than the 'critically thinking' intelligentsia. While Aptekman's 'Christian socialism' captures very well the underlying religious-existential motif of this shift to socialism, it is Akselrod who best exemplifies the Jewish radical's infatuation with the new grandiose perspectives of building "churches of the future" which would "conquer the whole world" and establish "universal brotherhood."

As a result Jewish nihilism became a cultural movement that swept through the Pale of the Settlement spawning revolutionary violence in its wake:

> Spear-heading this crusade were Jewish gymnasium students and rabbinical seminarians. In places like Vilna, Mogilev, Zhitomir, and Kiev, they formed 'circles of self-education' which, in turn, proliferated by attracting talmudists, pupils of Jewish crown schools, and privately educated children of wealthy Jewish merchants. Meeting more or less regularly, members would read and discuss Russian literature, articles from the Russian-Jewish periodical press, and works of the German-Jewish Haskalah. Some ventured to write their own Russian, Hebrew, and Yiddish compositions criticizing and satirizing Jewish life and its Orthodox leadership.[8]

The anti-Logos of the Talmud found its natural fulfillment in the anti-Logos of revolution. And nihilism, which was the new term for anti-Logos, found expression in revolutionary violence. This trajectory is best explicated from the lives of the revolutionaries themselves. Before long the philosophy of nihilism gave birth to revolutionary organizations. The first "genuine revolutionary organization, theSociety of Land and Freedom (Zemlia i Volia) came into existence in 1861. In 1864 Nikolai Ishutin and Dmitrii Karakazov created another revolutionary society known as "Organization." The terrorist arm of Organization was a "highly secretive inner group called 'Hell,'" which "stripped nihilism of its humanistic content by advocating unrestrained revolutionary violence."[9] From the mid-'60s onward, "ultra-extreme nihilists" like Karakazov, who "attempted to assassinate Alexander II on 4 April 1866" dominated radicalism in Russia. The fact that Karakazov was executed only "vindicated the terrorist legacy of the Ishutintsy and made Karakazov, who was

promptly executed, a hero in the eyes of future generations of revolutionaries." [10]

Haberer claims that "only a small number of Jews were attracted to the revolutionary experiments of nihilist radicalism between 1856 and 1868" because nihilism—for the time being, at least—was "a cultural experience which, while contributing to their radicalization within a traditional Jewish setting, was devoid of direct or immediate revolutionary implications." But that would change soon enough.

Before long the Russian revolutionary movement split into above ground essentially educational organizations like Chernyi Peredel, and under ground terrorist organizations like Narodnaia Volia, which were dominated by Jews. The connection between Jews and revolutionary violence is not coincidental. In its initial phase, the Russian revolutionary movement pursued what would be viewed in retrospect as an essentially Romantic attempt on the part of Russian intellectuals to move to the countryside and live among the peasants, enlightening them about the true extent of their oppression at the hands of the Russian ruling class. In practical terms, this often took the form of revolutionary Jews preaching to orthodox Russian peasants. The peasants invariably perceived the Jews as foreigners espousing some alien, godless ideology, and more often than not the revolutionary proselytizing backfired when the peasants reported their would-be liberators to the local police. The failure of the Jewish participation in the back to the land movement led to a change in strategy. Jewish revolutionaries decided to concentrate on what they could do best as *praktiky*, i.e., organizers but especially, as *techniky*, which brought to bear their skills as printers, forgers, smugglers, counterfeiters, and technicians, particularly in their expertise in handling explosives.

Obvious Presence

Despite the obvious presence of Jews in Chernyi Peredel, it has been argued that Jews qua Jews were more attracted to Narodnaia Volia because political terrorism was more congenial to Jewish panicipation than the theory and practice of traditional Populism. In this view - most forcefully put forth by Elias Tscherikower - the new political orientation and its urban-centred terrorist activity significantly 'broadened the range of possibilities for Jewish revolutionaries - both psychologically and factually'. Factually, it provided Jews with the unprecedented opportunity to be active in an urban environment that was much more conducive to their natural abilities and national characteristics: instead of acting as propagandists in the name of an alien ideology in an alien peasant environment, they now were able to partake in activities where their Jewishness was less of a liability than previously. Without feeling a sense of inferiority, without necessarily divesting themselves of their Jewish traits, as Narodovoltsy they could participate fully and effectively in the sort of work for which they were ideally suited as Jews. In short, their characteristically Jewish abilities of 'underground organization' and 'technical know-how' were a real asset readily appreciated and sought after by their Russian comrades. Psychologically, Narodnaia Volia provided Jews with a political rationale for revolutionary action that was much more in tune with their experience of Jewish rightlessness than Populist abstractions of social revolution.

Haberer's explanation of Jews' attraction to revolutionary violence is good as it goes but it ignores the ontological connection between nihilism and violence. Jews were more attracted to violence because they came from a more nihilistic background. The Talmud had trained them to treat both the moral order and the goyim with contempt, and this dehumanization made it easier to kill people for a sacred cause. As Salo Baron has pointed out, Russians who ended up being interrogated by the Cheka, the Soviet secret police, after the revolution were more likely to be tortured by Jews because Jews did not view the goyim as fellow citizens. The Jews who had been taught as children to hold the goyim and their Christian moral law in contempt were going to be less inhibited in engaging in violence and mayhem than their Christian counterparts. If the entire Jewish people could be sacrificed to the abstractions of the Talmud, it was only a short step to claim that goyim should be sacrificed to the revolutionary cause.

If we combine both internal and external reasons, it is easy to see why the revolutionary movement in Russia would become both more Jewish and more

violent as the 19th century progressed. That progression is mirrored in the lives of the revolutionaries themselves. For Mark Natanson,

> nihilism proved to be an ideology of salvation. Having been sensitized from early on to the discrepancy between the reality and ideals of traditional Jewish society and beginning to lose, if not having already lost, faith in Judaism, he readily identified himself with the sort of 'nihilist personality' that emerged from Chernyshevsky's What Is to Be Done? and Pisarev's characterization of Bazarov - a person that would 'help cure society of its moral and physical ills by his exemplary life and useful work' and whose 'rational egoism was really a form of puritanism based upon the discipline of scientific work and a "scientific" ethic. . . . The influence of nihilism and Jewishness in shaping Natanson's personality was also recognized by his contemporaries. Lev Deich and Osip Aptekman imply that, as in their own case, maskilic ideals and nihilist prescriptions contributed to Natanson's radicalization. Others have noted that while Natanson's practical and businesslike approach to revolutionary affairs was due to his upbringing in a Jewish merchant household, his intellectual perseverance bordering on dogmatism derived from his talmudic studies.[11]

Natanson's Jewishness made it more likely that his nihilism would find expression in violence rather than attempts to educate the benighted peasantry.

> The degree to which nihilism retained its hold on Natanson was, as will be shown later, quite commonly replicated among Jewish intelligenty of the 1870s. In the person of Natanson, however, this translated itself politically into a concrete Jewish revolutionary contribution in the form of a programme that introduced a party-political dimension into an ostensibly apolitical Populist movement. Therefore, to put it succinctly, it was his Jewish background and Jewish-tinted nihilism which, in formulating the original programme of the future Chaikovtsy, made Natanson emphasize 'scientific rationalism' rather than romantic peasantism, political rather than social revolution, the intelligentsia rather than 'the people'. [12]

In 1875, Mark Natanson returned to St. Petersburg after four years of exile. In response to the disillusionment which police repression, peasant inertia and the xenophobic hostility of the masses had created in the revolutionary movement,[13] Natanson answered Chernyshevsky's question, "Chto delat?" by building "a party of struggle." Because of the fear of being labeled anti-Semitic, scholars cannot address the issue of "'how and why' a Jew created Russia's first truly revolutionary party."[14]

One of the Jews attracted to Natanson's revolutionary party of struggle was Aron Zundelevich. In his novel The Career of a Nihilist, Sergei Kravchinskii has Zundelevich say that he loves the Nihilist more than he loves his fellow Jews:

> We Jews, we love our race, which is all we have on the earth. I love it deeply and warmly. Why should I love your peasants, who hate and illtreat my people with, blind barbarity, who to-morrow will perhaps loot the house of my father, an honorable working-man, and brutally assault him, as they have done to thousands of other poor hard-working Jews? I can pity your peasants for what but contempt can one feel for such wholesale cowards? No, there is nothing in your Russia worth caring for. But I knew the Nihilists, and I loved them even more than my own race. I joined and fraternized with them, and that is the only tie which binds me to your country. As soon as we have done with Your Tsar's despotism, I shall expatriate myself forever, and settle somewhere in Germany . . . Germany is the only land where we are not total strangers.[15]

The nihilist was in some sense the ultimate Jew, the apotheosis of the Jew, and the if activity is the expression of essence, then the essence of nihilism was violent revolutionary action. Without action of this sort nihilism becomes nothing more than non-being. The nihilist needs violent action to prevent the slide into nonexistence which his philosophy brings about as its ultimate *telos*. The more violent the action the better it acts as the antidote to non-being.

This probably explains Zundelevich's attraction to dynamite, a new form of explosive that became increasingly important in revolutionary circles during the latter part of the 19th century. Kravchinskii, who before becoming a novelist was a fellow nihilist and terrorist, "conducted experiments in the Swiss mountains to test the efflcacy of dynamite and other explosives" at Zundelevich's behest.[16] Zundelevich told Kravchinskii that dynamite, out of which the nihilists fashioned "elegant and slender bombs," was the "most modern means available" to kill the Tsar and that it "corresponds best with the targets singled out for terrorist acts."[17]

Natanson attracted more and more Jews to the revolutionary movement, and Jews like Ginzburg, Epshtein, Finkelshtein and Zundelevich created an organization that mirrored their need for revolutionary violence rather than educating the peasantry:

> With Zundelevich's extensive underground organization at their disposal, the Natansonvtsy controlled a network of illegal border crossings which connected them via Berlin, Koenigsberg and Vilna with the two most important centres of Russian revolutionary printing activity abroad, London

> and Geneva. This line of communication and its central transfer points for goods and people was manned almost exclusively by Jews. In the border region between Koenigsberg and Vilna, Jewish smugglers - chief among them Zalman and his family - took care of the revolutionary ware, conveying it across the frontier by all sorts of ingenious enterprise." Particularly sensitive and valuable items such as printing press accessories and, later on, dynamite were taken directly to St Petersburg by Zalman himself and sometimes by Zundelevich. But generally the 'port of entry' was Vilna, which since the days of the first Vilna circle served as the main post once for 'red mail' to and from Russia.[18]

When Natanson visited Zundelevich in the fall of 1875 most of this underground infrastructure was already well in place. On June 11, 1876 Zundelevich and Natanson's organization attempted to murder the suspected agent-provocateur Nikolai E. Gorinovich by pouring sulphuric acid on his face. Gorinovich survived and provided the police with evidence about Zundelevich and Natanson's terrorist cell. In 1877 nihilism led to terrorism in the most literal sense of the term when Zundelevich and Natanson's organization murdered "the railroad worker N. F. Sharashkin for betraying Mark Natanson and a large number of workers associated with his so-called 'Society of Friends.'" As a result of the Gorinovich affair, "assassinations were increasingly viewed as an acceptable, even legitimate, weapon of revolutionary revenge and defense."

Soon the south of Russia was awash in terrorist attacks. The reason that "the virus of terror spread first in the south" of Russia is because of the overwhelmingly Jewish participation in the revolutionary movement there:

> The statistical findings of Kappeler (as they relate to Jews) show up in the presence of Jewish radicals in almost all "southern circles" which were directly or indirectly involved in acts of terrorism or physical resistance against the authorities. For instance, the Elizavetgrad circle of Lev I. Rozenfeld, which was closely linked with the Kiev Buntarists and helped them in organizing the Gorinovich assassination, consisted almost exclusively of Jews. The same was the case in Nikolaev where the "rebels" were in contact with, Solomon Vinenberg, Aron Cornbet, Lev and Savelii Zlaropolskii, all of whom were leading activists among the local, Predominantly Jewish, radical youth. Indeed, Jews were a major and very active component in virtually all radical circles which in the south of Russia acted as catalysts of political terrorism.[19]

In the spring of 1878, Solomon Vittenberg returned to Nikolaev after a trip to Odessa in the south of Russia where terrorism was is full swing and

announced that he was going to introduce a "new style" of terrorism by blowing up Tsar Alexander II's train with pyroxylin when it passed through Nidolaev on its way to St. Petersburg in August. Vittenberg was arrested on August 16, 1878, when police discovered his address on someone sent from Odessa to assist in the assassination attempt, and hanged one year later. All of the conspirators in the Nikolaev plot to assassinate the Czar but one were Jewish.[20] According to Haberer,

> Scholars have justly cautioned against perceiving Judaism as a motivating force of Jewish radicalization. But to ignore or deny the workings of this religious dimension in the psychology of revolutionary Jews would be short-sighted. It prevents us from comprehending the mental processes which drove alienated men and existentially troubled individuals like Vittenberg to sanctify socialism and to commit themselves to terrorism. **[21]**

Enlightenment Led to Nihilism

The revolutionary career of Grigorii Davidovich Goldenberg (1855-80) is another example of how the Enlightenment led to Nihilism and Nihilism to revolutionary violence. In 1865, Grigorii's parents moved out of the shtetl town of Berdichev to Kiev, where his father opened a successful hardware business. With success came assimilation, and with assimilation an end to the practice of Jewish culture and religion. All of the Goldenberg children were given a secular eduction, and all of them were as a result "caught up in the revolutionary movement."[22] Grigorii, the oldest and most talented, was the "first to fall victim to the siren call of revolution." On February 9, 1879, Grigorii entered the inner circle of the terrorist elite when he assassinated Prince Dimitri Kropotkin, Govemor of Kharkov. One month later he was plotting the assassination Tsar Alexander II with the Zemlevoltsy of St. Petersburg:

> Goldenberg himself was a perfect, and timely, example for demonstrating the supposed truth that behind every terrorist plot there was a Jew. Here was a Jewish terrorist par excellence who had not only assassinated the Governor General of Kharkov, but who had advised others to kill the Tsar - a task, moreover, which he desired to execute himself. In addition, his written testimony was full of Jewish names implicating Jews like Aronchik and Zundelevich in terrorist activities. In the light of the previous arrest of Vittenberg and Jewish associates of his circle, including Gobet, all this merely confirmed the government's suspicion that Jews were principal agents of terrorism.

Eventually, on March 1, 1881, Narodnaia Volia succeeded in assassinating Tsar Alexander II and the government began to see Jewish nihilism as the source of revolutionary activity in Russia.

> The ever growing Jewish participation in the revolutionary movement, and its increasing visibility as Jews became more frequently linked to highly publicized acts of terrorism, was duly registered by those who had least to gain from it - the government officials. Although some noticed that there was a nexus between the radicalization of Jews and *yiddishe rektlozikeyt*, the general feeling was that from time immemorial the 'Hebrew race' had been an alien and subversive element in society and that its decomposing powers had reached epidemic proportions due to the influx of Jews into Russian society via educational, professional, and commercial

channels. This feeling gained in force as more and more Jewish names appeared conspicuously on the pages of government reports and newspaper articles dealing with political subversion in general and terrorist plots in particular.

A consensus was forming among the Russian elites. As a result of the Enlightenment, Jews had been "set free but not satisfied." The name for that unhappy state of affairs was Jewish Nihilism. Jewish nihilism was the source of revolutionary violence in Russia. "To all the other good qualities which you Jews possess," the governor of Vilna told a group of Jewish leaders sarcastically in 1872, "about the only thing you need is to become nihilists too." Commenting on Mlodetskii's execution, Novoe vremia opined that "these Jews, being from time immemorial the representatives of the revolutionary spirit, stand now at the head of Russian Nihilists."

Though highly prejudiced in its assertion that Jews, along with Poles, were the mainspring of the revolution, the tsarist government obviously had a case in blaming 'Jewish nihilists' for the wave of terrorism that had rocked the ship of state since 1878-79 and even claimed its captain in 1881. In some ways, and in spite of their exaggerations, its officials had a more accurate appreciation of the role of Jews in the terrorist movement than the revolutionaries themselves or historians who joined them in downplaying die Jewish contribution.[23]

In spite of the crackdown following the assassination of the tsar in 1881, Jewish commitment to revolutionary violence only intensified. In 1884 Shternberg wrote an influential pamphlet entitled Political Terror in Russia, in which he advocated "systematic terrorism" including the "systematic killing of the tsar and the most important, the most outspoken enemies of the people and the intelligentsia." Terror, Shternberg concluded was "the only form of struggle possible against autocracy."

Arguments like this caused a split between Jews and Gentiles in the movement. During debates at the socialism congress, Jews argued for "'the systematic and uninterrupted repetition of terrorist acts' as the only means to destroy tsarism." Haberer concludes that, all anti-Semitism notwithstanding, there was a "factual basis underlying the phobia in official and reactionary circles that the Jew was poised to destroy Holy Tsarist Russia." Starting of with Shebeko's claim that 80 per cent of socialists in southern Russia were Jews, Haberer makes it plain that statistical evidence alone "makes it hard to ignore that throughout the 1870s and 1880s Jews were a substantial element in Russian revolutionary activity."

What they sought can best be described as an abstract and futuristic

idealism of assimilation qua emancipation in a denationalized and secularized democratic society, ideally of universal scope. Leaving the world of their childhood did not necessarily imply its total abandonment in one act of irreversible forgetfulness. For many this departure under the sacred halo of socialism was the next best solution to their own existential problems

Father Seraphim Rose, an American convert to Russian orthodoxy, dealt with these "existential problems" which led to and flowed from nihilism from an orthodox perspective. Rose claimed that "Violence is no merely incidental aspect of the Nihilist Revolution, but a part of its essence." According to Marxist "dogma," "force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one"; [41] appeals to violence, and even a kind of ecstasy at the prospect of its use, abound in revolutionary literature. Bakunin invoked the "evil passions" and called for the unchaining of "popular anarchy" in the cause of "universal destruction," and his "Revolutionary Catechism" is the primer of ruthless violence; Marx was fervent in his advocacy of "revolutionary terror" as the one means of hastening the advent of Communism; Lenin defined the "dictatorship of the proletariat" (the stage in which the Soviet Union still finds itself) as "a domination that is untrammeled by law and based on violence." Demagogic incitement of the masses and the arousing of the basest passions for revolutionary purposes have long been standard Nihilist practice.

If metaphysics, which is the science of being qua being, can also be called "theology," then the root of nihilism, which was an attack on God qua being, had to be theological. Hence, Rose claims that nihilism is ultimately a "war against God." Nihilism prosecutes this war against being by a violent attack on Old Order. Political categories like right and left are irrelevant; both Bolshevism and Nazism grow out of nihilism and find their expression in violence:

> The most violent revolutionaries--a Nechayev or Bakunin, a Lenin or Hitler, and even the demented practitioners of the "propaganda of the deed"--dreamed of the "new order" their violent destructions of the Old Order would make possible; Dada and "anti-literature" seek not the total destruction of art, but the path to a "new" art; the passive Nihilist, in his "existential" apathy and despair, sustains life only by the vague hope that he may yet find some kind of ultimate satisfaction in a world that seems to deny it.[24]

Violence is inseparable from nihilism. Nihilism finds its fulfillment in violence. Both Bolshevism and National Socialism are equally violent forms of Nihilism. Both find their fulfillment in violence:

> Hitler's role in the Nihilist program was more specialized and

provincial, but nonetheless essential. Even in failure -- in fact, precisely in the failure of its ostensible aims -- Nazism served the cause of this program. Quite apart from the political and ideological benefits which the Nazi interlude in European history gave to the Communist powers (Communism, it is now widely and erroneously believed, if evil in itself, still cannot be as evil as Nazism), Nazism had another, more obvious and direct, function. Goebbels explained this function in his radio broadcasts in the last days of the War.

The bomb-terror spares the dwellings of neither rich nor poor; before the labor offices of total war the last class barriers have had to go down. ... Together with the monuments of culture there crumble also the last obstacles to the fulfillment of our revolutionary task. Now that everything is in ruins, we are forced to rebuild Europe. In the past, private possessions tied us to a bourgeois restraint. Now the bombs, instead of killing all Europeans, have only smashed the prison walls which kept them captive. ... In trying to destroy Europe's future, the enemy has only succeeded in smashing its past; and with that, everything old and outworn has gone.

Nazism thus, and its war, have done for Central Europe (and less thoroughly, for Western Europe) what Bolshevism did in its Revolution for Russia: destroyed the Old Order, and thus cleared the way for the building of the "new." Bolshevism then had no difficulty in taking over where Nazism had left off, within a few years the whole of Central Europe had passed under the "dictatorship of the proletariat" -- i.e., Bolshevist tyranny -- for which Nazism had effectively prepared the way.

The Nihilism of Hitler was too pure, too unbalanced, to have more than a negative, preliminary role to play in the whole Nihilist program. Its role, like the role of the purely negative first phase of Bolshevism, is now finished, and the next stage belongs to a power possessing a more complete view of the whole Revolution, the Soviet power upon which Hitler bestowed, in effect, his inheritance in the words, "the future belongs solely to the stronger Eastern nation."

The thirty years of Nihilist war and revolution between 1914 and 1945 have been an ideal breeding-ground for the "new human type." The new man was "deracinated" by the nihilist revolution. The old Christian civilization was destroyed by this 30 years war.

What, more realistically, is this "mutation," the "new man"? He is the

rootless man) discontinuous with a past that Nihilism has destroyed, the raw material of every demagogue's dream; the "free-thinker" and skeptic, closed only to the truth but "open" to each new intellectual fashion because he himself has no intellectual foundation; the "seeker" after some "new revelation," ready to believe anything new because true faith has been annihilated in him; the planner and experimenter, worshipping "fact" because he has abandoned truth, seeing the world as a vast laboratory in which he is free to determine what is "possible"; the autonomous man, pretending to the humility of only asking his "rights," yet full of the pride that expects everything to be given him in a world where nothing is authoritatively forbidden; the man of the moment, without conscience or values and thus at the mercy of the strongest "stimulus"; the "rebel," hating all restraint and authority because he himself is his own and only god; the "mass man," this new barbarian, thoroughly "reduced and "simplified" and capable of only the most elementary ideas, yet scornful of anyone who presumes to point out the higher things or the real complexity of life.

As the foregoing passage makes clear, the new civilization which emerged from the ashes of World War II was Jewish. The new man was a Jew because only the deracinated could flourish in a world where the old order had been destroyed. Rose describes the post-World War II era and its culture as "the most concentrated era of Nihilism in human history." The war turned everyone into Jews by making Nihilism the world's regnant ideology. Yuri Slezkine, another Russian, noticed something similar in his book The Jewish Century:

> It is easy to dismiss as fantasy the "new humanity" foreseen by a Hitler or a Lenin; and even the plans of those quite respectable Nihilists among us today who calmly discuss the scientific breeding of a "biological superman," or project a utopia for "new men" to be developed by the narrowest "modern education" and a strict control of the mind, seem remote and only faintly ominous. But confronted with the actual image of a "new man," an image brutal and loathsome beyond imagination, and at the same time so unpremeditated, consistent, and widespread in contemporary art, one is caught up short, and the full horror of the contemporary state of man strikes one a blow one is not likely soon to forget.

Superman was created by two Jews in the '30s. So it should come as no surprise that the "Biological superman" is also a Jew. He has super DNA. Obsession with DNA among the deracinated was another sign that we had all become Jews in the wake of Nihilism's destruction of the old order.

David Cooper

In *The Believer*, the Jewish Nazi gets a call from a *New York Times* reporter. In real life, the editor of *Culture Wars* gets a call from one of his subscribers, who praises *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit* and then announces, "I'm a Jew, and I agree with everything you have written about the Jews." It turns out that my Jewish admirer is not just a Jew but an anti-Semite as well, because, as he puts it at another point in our conversation, "Jews make the best anti-Semites."

In the winter of 1992 David Cooper was working as a painter in New York, when one of his colleagues asked if he would mind if he turned on the radio. What began as an interest in the Clarence Thomas hearings ended up as a long-term commitment to listening to the local NPR station, whose orientation he described as totally Jewish. One afternoon he remembers hearing a report on a drive-by shooting which took place in Israel. The fact that they were in Brooklyn at the time and that drive-by shooting were commonplace there but never reported on led him to conclude that Jews control the media, and that controlling the flow of information allows them to control the world. Exposing that control then became his mission in life.

David was born in 1966 in Manhattan, which he describes as "an expensive Jewish ghetto." David was born into an intact family, but he soon became a casualty of the sexual revolution. He blames his mother for the destruction of their family.

"My dad was a doctor (GP) and my mom was the daughter of a wealthy judge. She was a virgin when she married my dad, but the '60s definitely impacted her. When I was three years old, she threw my dad out of the house. Dad then used that divorce to check out from normalcy. She became what some people would call a whore. She had three small children in the house and a new boyfriend every six months. I don't accept that kind of behavior. It's dissolute and amoral and typically Jewish.

"My created a new future for himself which involved sleeping around. My mom got into 'law' after she threw my dad out. She started as a court reporter and retired as a lobbyist for SUNY Binghamton. In the meantime she ran a couple of bar associations; one was in New York, where she slept with half the lawyers (I jest). She [eventually] got out of running the bar because 'that was too many 'nasty Jewish kunts even for her.'"

David claims that his childhood became a function of his mother's career

as a lawyer and sexual libertine.

> We weren't raised religious. We were barely 'raised' at all. We were left to our own devices and demise. The baby sitters were around just long enough 'til my older brother could 'manage' us on his own, probably when I was like eight years old. I'm sure there was no babysitter after that.
>
> "Our dad got us on Thursday nights and every other weekend. He did what he could, I guess. He tried to be a good dad, but he didn't really provide any moral compass. He just told us that if we ever rode a motorcycle we'd need to wear a helmet, and that if we wanted to be a doctor we couldn't marry. And he told me that if I ever got caught dealing drugs that he'd execute me, with a needle, on a table—a medical table of some sort, I imagine, a gurney, I guess.

David now claims that his parents' divorce had a devastating effect on everyone involved.

> It ruined my childhood and much of my adulthood. I'll probably never get over it. She sure didn't provide any moral compass. I couldn't keep track of all her boyfriends. They were around from my earliest memories. It was like a revolving door.
>
> "When I was growing up, my best friends were typically Jewish, but I never viewed her as a Jew until I came to understand Jewish values. I can't really explain this. (I could try.) I didn't identify as such. Like attracts like I suppose. That may explain why probably half my best friends throughout my life have been Jews, and why I've dated countless Jewish women, at least a dozen that I've identified so far.

In 1978, when David was 11 years old, his mother moved him and his siblings to the Catskills. The move effectively changed nothing. David's mother brought the hippie commune mentality she adopted when she divorced his father with her when she moved. Finding no guidance at home, David took a job at a restaurant shortly after arriving in the Catskills. By this point his siblings were starting to imitate his mother, which is to say, they were in his mind becoming "moral degenerates." Soon he found himself working for his brothers who were now in the restaurant business. He worked as a sales manager for his older brother's import business in New York but lost that job when the company when bankrupt because of embezzlement. His brother then built a restaurant which was a tremendous success until "he cheated someone else into buying it based on his famous bookkeeping. He is able to cook books so that anyone, including

bank auditors, believe whatever he wants them to believe about the success of his business."

> My older brother is the least guilty of them all, but he has no moral standing in the world. His life is a lie. They all lie, to themselves and most everyone else about themselves. They all live lies. Their lives are lies. They are all morally repugnant. They are all so typically Jewish. There's not a moral bone between them all combined.

His experiences as a child left him full of anger and may have contributed to the alcoholism and substance abuse with which he has battled for most of his adult life. Although David doesn't make the connection himself, it's difficult not to see his alcoholism as one of the *sequelae* of his parents' divorce.

> My life was totally dissolute, but I didn't live lies—not like they do. I lied to myself, but I didn't lie to others, besides the women when they asked me if I had a girlfriend or if I drank too much. I lied to women, about alcohol and other women, where I'd been and the like. I typically had a couple girlfriends at any given time, but these women really wanted to hear the lies.

David's mother threw him out of the house when he was 15. The issue was attendance at school. David claimed that he didn't have time for school since he was now working full-time in the restaurant business. Finding himself homeless on the streets, he met "some old queen who took me in. He could hardly keep his hands off me, but I managed. I was his houseboy. I was his chauffeur. I was his handyman and his friend."

David became involved in music, but, given the circumstances in his life, that led to trouble too. In 1993 he got into a fight with a Negro who used a baseball bat to rearrange David's facial features. $75,000 later his face is "still kind of lopsided," but not noticeably so. He has subsequently been assaulted by "a dozen African-Americans for being too white, I guess." Or maybe the brawls came about as a result of "being careless, like about were I was and stuff."

Through it all, David's family life has been a constant source of anger, which he projected onto the Jewish race. "Jews," he opined, "are the worst thing that happened to mankind, and the '60s revolution was a Jewish revolution." When I mention that he sounds a lot like Samuel Roth in *Jews Must Live*. David admits to having read the book and agreeing with Roth's negative take on the Jews. Roth earned a place in the Valhalla of Supreme Court decisions when he lost a landmark obscenity case. He earned literary immortality when he ended up being excoriated in James Joyce's unreadable novel *Finnegans Wake* for having

pirated an edition of *Ulysses*. Roth claims that he ended up serving time for an obscenity rap because a Jew lured him into sending obscene material through the mail. Roth then extrapolated from his unhappy experience to the Jewish race. "It dawned on me suddenly, blindingly," Roth wrote in a book which set out to prove "what a hideous swamp the Jews have made of Western Civilization," "that all the evils of my life had been perpetrated by Jews. . . . On every side I was being eaten alive by Jews."[25]

Some might call Roth a Jewish Nazi. "Do you believe a whole civilized nation would stand aside, witness what Hitler is doing to the Jews without a protest, unless there were real abuses on the part of the Jews which justified what is happening?"[26] Roth is aware of the contradiction but insists on the truth of the claim when he writes "I am myself a Jew, I know it. But I am a Jew who has been brought to the point where he so loathes his people that he thinks in terms of their destruction."[27]

The explanation of Roth's feeling is fairly straightforward. The main cause of anti-Semitism is Jewish behavior. "Anti-Semitism is the natural effect of such a social cause. I cannot understand why such a deep mystery is made of this simple cause." Since their behavior renders Jews, as St. Paul put it, "enemies of the whole human race,"[28] and since Jews have more contact with Jews than the *goyim,* and since they often bear the brunt of Jewish behavior, it is only natural that a Jew would become an anti-Semite. It would be a bit of a stretch to call St. Paul a Jewish Nazi, but there are some Jews who might see him as the archetypal self-hating Jew. Whatever the case, his views are not that dissimilar from fellow Jew Roth, who writes, "We are a people of vultures living on the labor and the good nature of the rest of the world."[29] Roth cites Edward I, king of England, who expelled the Jews from that land in 1290 and in doing so set a precedent for other Christian lands. Roth puts the blame for these expulsions squarely on the shoulders of the Jews:

> Wherever they come that are welcomed, permitted to settle down, and join in the general business of the community. But one by one the industries of the country close to them because of unfair practices—until it being impossible to longer hold in check the wrath of a betrayed people, there is violence and, inevitably, an ignominious ejection of the whole race from the land. There is not a single instance when the Jews have not fully deserved the bitter fruit of the fury of their persecutors.[30]

David claims:

> Israel gets his *shabbas goy* to do his dirty work. Judah doesn't get his

> hands dirty unless he has to. Judah gets the *shabbas goy* to fight his wars for him. Israel called for Hitler's head on March 24, 1933. Twelve years and 48 days later, they got it. At what cost? Upwards of 70 million dead gentiles and well over 4 trillion american dollars. At what cost to Judah? How much did Judah's war on Hitler cost Judah? And what did Judah get from this war? He got Israel and much, much more.
>
> Back to the present. Why are we the sole superpower? How did it get to be this way? Of course we had no stake in either of those world wars. Nothing, but Israel dragged us into them, and she built a military empire using American tax dollars and men as their *shabbas goyim*. What is this vast military empire protecting? Not America. Judah has ruined us.

When he's not sounding like Samuel Roth, David sounds a lot like Danny Balint:

> Israel gave us communism, Lenin, and Stalin, and this all led from Israel's war on Germany to the cold war and Korea and Vietnam. This is all Israel's doing with her Judeo-communism. Multiculturalism is part of Judah's strategy to destroy us and to destroy western civilization. The Jews were behind the sexual revolution. Everything they did related to culture was a form of revolution.

In the year 2000, David discovered the writings of Professor Kevin MacDonald. As a result, David, like Danny Balint in *The Believer*, became convinced that race was central to understanding the human condition. In 2008 he was celebrating Thanksgiving with relatives when the topic of race came up. "Wouldn't it be great if we were Jewish?" he asked one of his cousins, who answered, "Well, as a matter of fact, we have many Jewish relatives."

David then went and had his DNA tested and discovered that he was a Jew. Which means, of course, that up until that time he wasn't a Jew. What was he then? It turns out that David was baptized as a Catholic; as was his mother, as was his mother's mother. At this point the geneology gets a bit misty, and it is at this point that the Jewish ancestors begin to appear on his family tree.

Before going any further, it should be noted that the phenomenon of suddenly discovering Jewish DNA in the family tree is not uncommon these days. The most famous example of this, of course, is Christopher Hitchens. Hitchens sees Judaism is as something racial. After discovering that one of his grandmothers was Jewish, he claimed that this helped him to understand why he had been a revolutionary for his entire life. The idea that Jewish revolutionary behavior is a function of Jewish DNA and is, therefore, ineradicable is an idea

that Hitchens shares with Adolf Hitler, which brings us back once again to the Jewish Nazi theme.

Hitchens' brother Peter, who shares *ipso facto* the same genetic make-up, remains an Anglican, which is how both brothers were raised, and has apparently experienced a conversion away from revolutionary behavior, which he now associates with the *Zeitgeist* of the '60s and not his own DNA. As to Christopher's conversion and his subsequent atheism, Peter feels that it has more to do with his brother's sexual behavior, specifically his abandoning of his pregnant wife and taking up with a Jewish woman, rather than some irresistible urge emanating from his chromosomes, or the 12.5 percent of which he inherited from one of his grandmothers.

In the end, Christopher Hitchens' Judaism comes down to hatred of Christ and the Logos he embodies, a point which he made clear when he delivered the Daniel Pearl Memorial Lecture a UCLA on March 3, 2010:

> Any real Christian, any serious believing Christian, would give everything he owned to have a personal meeting with Jesus of Nazareth. Nothing more could be desired than that. they yearn for it, they thirst for it, they hunger for it. No serious Moslem could want anything more than to have met himself with the messenger of God, with the prophet Mohammed.
>
> But there were no Ukranians around at that time. There were no Poles at the crucifiction. There were no Irish people in Mecca and Medina. There's only one people that's still around that both of these imposters and said 'No', 'No sale', 'Don't believe it'. Do you think that's ever going to be forgiven? Of course it's not. Of course it will never be forgiven. They say Jesus and they spat in his face. They saw the prophet Mohammed and they said, 'this guy's just a warlord'. And of Jesus they said 'he's a just a crackpot rabbi' and also a great blasphemer - Maimonides, in one of his sharper passages 'our sages never did a better thing than when they got rid of that rabble-rousing imposter.'
>
> "Well, [it] makes you proud, I hope. You shouldn't want to be forgiven for getting a thing like that right. But don't go to any mushy ecumenical outreach meeting with these people - it's a waste of time.

Another even more unlikely example of someone discovering via DNA that he was Jewish is Minister Louis Farrakhan, who announced his Jewishness at a synagogue prayer service in Jamaica. Not surprisingly, this ongoing narrative of surprising conversions reached the level of paroday in a recent issue of *Forward* that announced that Glenn Beck was really a Jew.

> Following the recent revelations that Glenn Beck, born Bekershteyn) shares the Jewish genetic marker, the Cohen Modal aplotype, he has been brushing up on his Yiddish and planning his holidays … Beck fiddled nervously with a red kabbalah thread around his wrist. "I guess I'd always had doubts," he mumbled.

The irony in David's conversion is almosgt as overpowering as the moral pleas bargaining and opportunism in the case of Christopher Hitchens' conversion. David became a Jew largely because of reading Kevin MacDonald. When he got his DNA test back and found at the he was (probably)[31] a Sephardic Jew, David welcomed the results because "it gives me credibility. That's why I joined the synagogue. I needed the credibility. If you're not a Jew, you can't talk about the Jews. If you're not a Jew, you're going to be marginalized. Only Jews are authorized to discuss these subjects in public." As if to give the indisputable proof of what he just said, David cited the case of E. Michael Jones. "The greatest gift I have ever gotten is to learn that we were Jewish." And then to make matters even more confusing, David confides to me that "there are lots of Jews on our team."

Upon reflection, this is less surprising that it might seem at first. In fact, David's transformation from a baptized Catholic to a practicing Jew flows fairly logically from his engagement in MacDonald's writing. In an essay on anti-Semitism, MacDonald admits candidly at one point:

> But the reality is that I greatly admire Jews as a group that has pursued its interests over thousands of years, while retaining its ethnic coherence and intensity of group commitment. There have been ups and downs in Jewish fortunes, to be sure; but their persistence, at times in the face of long odds, and their spectacular success at the present time are surely worthy of emulation.[32]

At another point in the same essay, MacDonald claims: "The point is that Jewish elites have been hugely influential in advancing the interests of their people. This is surely a goal to emulate."[33]

MacDonald's involvement with the Jews dates back to his days at the University of Wisconsin when he was involved with radical politics. In his memoir *Commies*, Ron Radosh has documented how the largely Jewish Communist Party targeted the University of Wisconsin at Madison for takeover in the '60s. When MacDonald got swept up into New Left politics, he became involved in the sexual revolution, and because of his involvement in that, he ceased practicing the Catholic faith. Sociobiology then filled the vacuum which

the abandoned Catholic faith left behind.[34]

As a result there are at least three competing Kevin MacDonalds out there, and the permutations involved in the differing positions which each MacDonald *persona* represents can lead to strange results, as they did when David decided to become a Jew.

There is, first of all, Kevin MacDonald the scholar. This man does admirable research into Jewish influence on our culture. Then there is Kevin MacDonald the sociobiologist, who has to claim that Jews are racially superior because they, as a small minority constituting only around two percent of the population in the United States, have triumphed in the struggle for existence that is the crucible of all value. The Jews have taken control of all of this country's cultural choke points and now control American culture, and they have accomplished this feat in the face of overwhelming demographic odds.

Survival of the Fittest

Survival of the fittest is a preposterous tautology, but it is, nonetheless, the cornerstone of sociobiology. If it is true that only the fittest prevail in the struggle for existence, then the inescapable conclusion which we must draw is that the Jews are the master race, and that they deserve their position of pre-eminence because they earned it on the battleground of evolutionary conflict, which is the only arena of significance. The sociobiology crowd must conclude that Jews are racially and biologically superior because they have triumphed against all other ethnic groups, including ethnic groups much larger than their own, in the struggle for existence. End of story. *Non datur tertius.* It was this aspect of sociobiology that led David paradoxically to admire the Jews and to want to become one, even if deploring all the while their pernicious effect on society. After all, Kevin MacDonald, the sociobiologist, has written in response to John Derbyshire:

> Derbyshire complains about my statement that, "the human mind was not designed to seek truth but rather to attain evolutionary goals." I was merely expressing a principle of evolutionary biology that has been of fundamental importance since the revolution inaugurated by G. C. Williams and culminating in E. O. Wilson's synthesis: Organisms are not designed to communicate truthfully with the others but to persuade them -- to manipulate them to serve their interests.

And this leads us to the third Kevin MacDonald, the lapsed Catholic who still retains the moral indignation which he learned from his religious training as a child. This persona leads MacDonald to impose moral judgements on the conclusions he has derived from sociobiology, even if they completely contradict his sociobiological premises. So the final conclusion—Jews have triumphed in the ethnic struggle for existence, but this is a bad thing—is an oxymoron based on a combination of two completely incompatible world-views, MacDonald's sociobiology and the residual moral consciousness which he retains as a lapsed Catholic.

Georg Ratzinger

Catholicism as practiced in the wake of Vatican II was hardly an unclouded mirror of Catholic tradition or without its own inconsistencies and self-contradictions, but for those who dug hard enough, a coherent position on the Jews could still be mined from the deposit of faith and the writing of the evangelists and the Church fathers. In fact, as late as 1892, Georg Ratzinger, great uncle of the present pope, had not only carried the teaching of the Church on the Jews known as *Sicut Iudeis non* into the present, he had applied it to the economic crisis that was gripping Europe at the time:

> The great medieval popes Innocent III and Gregory IX as well as the ecclesial synods and councils felt themselves called to take legal measures against the excesses of the Jews. They protected the life and existence of the Jews, but only under certain specific conditions. The Jews had to recognize the Christian social order and had to submit themselves to it. Whatever they had appropriated through usury and exploitation, they had to pay back to their victims. They were not allowed to occupy the choke points in the culture; they were not allowed to employ Christian servants in their houses, and when it came to their clothing they had to wear the so-called Jew hat in order to be immediately recognizable as Jews. Jews were in no way allowed to undermine the Christian social order. Jews who defamed Christ or Christians were punished. They were not allowed to do business on Christian holidays . . . and were not allowed to make usurious loans. During Holy Week they had to remain in their homes. Jews couldn't live wherever they pleased, but were confined to specific districts. It was also forbidden to sell house or real estate to Jews, or to rent to them, was also forbidden, as was living under the same roof with Jews. Similarly, Jews were forbidden to hire Christian nursemaids, servants, or day laborers.

Traditional Catholicism, in fact, provides the only coherent explanation of what came to be known in Georg Ratzinger's day as the Jewish question. As some indication of its coherence, the explanation is fairly simple. Following Napoleon's emancipation of the Jews, they took over the economies of one nation after another in Europe because their sharp business practices. What Ratzinger calls "*Juedisches Erwerbsleben*" allowed them to cheat the Christian natives, who had been taught to work hard, be trusting, and love their neighbor. [35] Jewish immorality, in other words, gave the Jews an unfair economic advantage in Catholic countries:

> The emancipation of the Jews, whose views and concepts contradicted the laws and customs of the Christian nations, could not help but have a destructive and corrupting effect on the entire Christian society. . . . This fact alone explains why Jews are able to accumulate riches so quickly. . . .The example of moral corruption has a contagious effect, and that explains the corrupting effect of Jewish influence on commerce.
>
> It was an act of supreme foolishness when in the years following 1789 the necessary protections for the social order were lifted immediately and universally. Once this happened it was only a matter of time before the Jews with their attitude toward business and commerce would gain the upper hand. This was particularly the case among the benevolent peoples who made up the population of Catholic nations, who had all grown up and been raised. . . . Others fell into the hands of the usurers and in spite of their frugality could not extricate themselves from its tentacles. Just about everyone was impoverished; and only the Jews got rich. [36]

Ratzinger's book appeared in 1892, at around the same time as *Rerum Novarum*, Pope Leo XIII's encyclical on the condition of the working classes, and the three-part series in *Civilta Cattolica* which warned Catholics about "the voracious octopus of Judaism."[37] The anger at Jewish business practices had reached the boiling point:

> The situation of the lucrative professions is totally different. In a few years, riches are amassed but at the cost of others. This form of profit is obscene, and the hatred and revulsion which the working classes feel toward these practices is fully justified. Envy isn't the cause of this hatred, but rather indignation at the unjust appropriation of value, that and the perception that this unjust appropriation constitutes an assault on the foundations of social life, evokes in the breast of the honest working man, bitter feelings. When the industrious and skilled worker, the honest civil servant, and the circumspect merchant in spite of all out exertion can't earn a living, when on the other hand this or that speculator, without any effort, can earn thousands or hundreds of thousands through IPOs or the issuing of T-bills, then this is a sign that the economic organism is so diseased that society is in urgent need of medicine and reform.[38]

Georg Ratzinger's GermanWikipedia page accuses him of "publishing antisemitic hate literature," but in making the charge they ignore the fact that Ratzinger goes out of his way in the same book to attack anti-Semitism as an un-Christian ideology. The anti-Semites of Ratzinger's day were capitalizing on the

hatred which Jewish business practices had created in the working classes. The source of that hatred is Jewish behavior, not Jewish DNA. And Jewish behavior has gotten out of control because the Christian majority was no longer willing to enforce the laws which had been enacted to defend the Christian social order. And the Christians lack the will to enforce the laws which protect the social order because they have become, by and large, Jews. Christian idealism has been disappearing all the while being replaced by the Jewish Weltanshauung in Christian circles. In the circles which feel and think like Christians, however, the revulsion at Jewish dealings and those of the baptized conversos is becoming more and more apparent. The reason that Christians now look on Jews with intense anger in their eyes is not to be found in race, and not in national origin, and not in anti-Semitism. The real path of resistance lies not anti-Semitism and its excesses. The real basis of the contemporary Jewish question lies in the moral inferiority of the Jewish view of commerce in comparison with the demands of Christianity.

"The solution to the Jewish question" lies in the application of the traditional Catholic teachings like *Sicut Iudeis non*. That means "not in allowing Christians in general to sink to the level of the lucrative occupations, but rather in raising the Jews to a higher sense of productive work, in higher numbers than is the present case, to the level of Christian mores as propounded by Christian teaching on commerce and property."

And that means rejecting anti-Semitism:

> We totally reject the anti-Semitism that is now being proposed . . . in Austria and by a number of the exalted German nationalists. Anti-Semitism understood as a matter of race stands in total contradiction to the Commandment of love of neighbor, without regard to race or national origin. On the other hand, it is the duty of every true Christian and patriot to take a stand against the dangerous errors of numerous Jews in the business world and to warn their fellow Christians about the dangerous illusions of the philosemites who predominate among the ruling elites.[39]

Georg Ratzinger's accusers also ignore the fact that Jews from Heinrich Graetz to Samuel Roth have said far worse things about the Jewish business ethics which the Ashkenazi have learned from the Talmud. According to Roth, the Jews are taught that they are "the salt of the earth" and that everything they

> see before them. . . is only to be won away with the superior brain with which God has endowed his chosen ones? Each of them, when he grows up, becomes an agency of cunning to defeat the civil law. The Polish Jew does not remain in Poland. He migrates. Eventually he finds himself a rich nest

> in England, in France, in Germany, in America, in one of the South American countries. To each of the counties of his invasion the Jew brings the whole bag of commercial tricks and statutory maneuvers with which he poisons the arteries of the civilized world.[40]

The short hand term for "Jewish business practices" is capitalism. Given the pernicious effects which capitalism has on every traditional culture, especially traditional Catholic cultures, the nations of Europe at the end of the 19th century were faced with a choice: either enforce the laws (e.g. the prohibition against usury, child labor, etc.) which were erected by the state to protect Christian culture against the Jews who were the cutting edge of capitalist subversion or become Jews.

By now, it should be obvious which course Europe and America chose. It comes out in *The Believer* when Danny, the Jewish Nazi, attempts to solicit a $5,000 contribution from a wealthy Wall Street banker. The banker tells Danny, "Forget the Jewish stuff; it doesn't play anymore. There's only the market now and it doesn't care who you are."

Danny: "You're a Jew. You may not realize it but you are."

Banker: "Maybe I am. Maybe we're all Jews now. What's the difference?"

The current pope mentions his Georg Ratzinger in an interview conducted by Peter Seewald:

> He was my great uncle, my father's uncle. He was a clergyman who had a doctorate in theology. In his capacity as a representative in the Bavarian state legislature and in the Reichstag, he was an early advocate for the rights of farmers and of the average man in general. I read the passages in the congressional record in which he attacked child labor, something which was unheard of at the time and considered by many an affront. He was obviously a tough guy, and because of his achievements and his political stature we were all proud of him.[41]

Proud or not, there is a significant gulf which separates the present pope from his great uncle. The most significant area of disagreement is their disparate views on the Jews. On the last day of February 2011, Joseph Ratzinger released volume II of his book *Jesus of Nazareth*. The big news surrounding the release of the book had to do with the Jews. As the AP headline put it, "Pope exonerates Jews for Jesus' death in new book." According to the same report, "Benedict concludes, it was the 'Temple aristocracy' and a few supporters of the figure Barabbas who were responsible," not the Jewish people.

Proud of His Great Uncle

The current pope should be proud of his great uncle. The real issue is whether the feeling would be reciprocal. Would a man who wrote that "There is nothing more repugnant than having to listen to educated Christians slandering their own people while at the same time glorifying the Jews" be proud of a great nephew who exonerated the Jews' of responsibility for Christ's death? Or a prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith who presided over the publication of an apology to the Jews issued by his predecessor? Probably not, because Onkel Georg had written even more pointedly:

> There would be no Jewish Question if the educated elites among the Christian peoples hadn't betrayed their own principles. At a time when Jews stand by even their own criminal element, we see Christian politicians and legislators betraying their own Christian faith on a daily basis and vying with each other to see who has the privilege of harnessing himself to the triumphal car of the Jews. In Parliament no Jew need defend another Jew, when their Christian lackeys do that for them.[42]

No matter how the traditional Catholic critique of the Jews has been effaced by recent Church pronouncements it remains both extant and coherent; it remains more coherent than the sociobiological position, because it is based on moral principles, which are then integrated into a coherent political and theological structure. The Catholic position is the opposite of the Darwinian position. According to Darwin and his epigoni, the superior race of necessity ends up victorious in any economic struggle for existence. According to the Catholic position, the exact opposite is true. Or as Georg Ratzinger puts it:

> In a contest between two rival world views the worse element often wins the upper hand and becomes the cause for the moral corruption of the people and the collapse of the state.[43] . . . Under the mild and benign character of the Catholic nations there was no resistance to the exploitation practiced by the Jews and the devastation it was to cause.[44]

According to Georg Ratzinger, the Jews succeeded in getting the economy of states like Austria and Hungary under their control, not because they were more intelligent (or had "higher IQs than Caucasians," as Professor MacDonald claims) but because their internalization of Talmudic culture had allowed them to become "skilled in the deceptions of economic warfare":

> It was to be expected that the Jews, who with centuries of practice

> became skilled in the deceptions of economic warfare and acquired the arts of exploitation to perfection, it was to be expected that they would take center stage under the regime of free competition. The Christian, among whom the overwhelming majority were accustomed to performing productive work, and who had been taught to avoid as immoral the type of deception that was typical of the arts of economic warfare, became the first victims of this exploitation, which made the Jews rich. Not talent, but rather sharp business practices; not knowledge and ability, not productive capabilities and production, but rather deception and exploitation of others is what makes the Jew rich and admired in society. The stock exchange, lending money, usury, paying in truck, in short all of the business practices which lead to easy and quick profits without productive work are the preferred trades of the Jew. If they devote themselves to study at the university, they turn more often than not to journalism, medicine and the law, because these occupations lead most easily and quickly to riches.[45]

The same can not be said for sociobiology, which presents a radically incoherent picture of the Jewish question, by simultaneously praising the Jews for their intelligence and excoriating them for its application. In the article we have already cited on Jewish involvement in multiculturalism MacDonald wrote, "There is indeed evidence that Jews, like East Asians, have higher IQs than Caucasians."

Ratzinger, however, dismisses the idea of superior intelligence as an explanation for the Jews' dominant role in quondam Christian societies:

> It isn't talent but rather sharp business practices; it isn't productivity but rather deception and the art of exploitation which earns the Jew his money and ensures his position of dominance among the big capitalists. . . . There is a curse upon all this egotistical business activity which leads to the wreck of society and the destruction of the social order. Everywhere where we find destruction and corruption, we find the Jew hard at work. The worst attack against the Christian religion and against the Church are all mounted by Jews.[46]

Unlike Professor MacDonald, Georg Ratzinger considers the Jew clever and conniving but morally defective. That means that his economic system is intellectually inferior to Christian economics. Ratzinger comes to the anti-Darwinian conclusion that Jewish economics succeeds because it is inferior, both morally and economically. If economics is defined properly, as the science of how to achieve the common good through economic exchange, it is ultimately inferior to the Christian economic system:

> We discover the quintessential nature of the present day Jewish question in the moral inferiority of the Jewish worldview in relation to the limitation of competition. To be precise, the overwhelming majority of Jews have no sense whatsoever of the role which morality plays in economic life. The only form of limitation which they recognize in business is the penal statute. If an opportunity to make money appears whose profit seems greater than the penalty imposed by the law, the Jew doesn't hesitate to treat the law with contempt.[47]

Jewish commerce can be characterized by two manifestations: 1) it is based on the exploitation of the work of others without any productive activity of its own and 2) it is characterized by gambling and speculation on the differentials in exchange as the way to achieve riches. The Christian view is the exact opposite. Christianity ensures decency in commerce by promoting honest toil or by promoting honest inheritance. Christianity forbids the exploitation of his neighbor through excessive economic power, and insists on the subordination of the good of the individual to the common good, as well as concern for the economically vulnerable. There is a direct contradiction between Christianity and Judaism, and any Christian community which allows the unrestrained exercise of Jewish business practices is committing suicide.[48]

As a result of succumbing to Jewish influence:

> The banks in Austria have become dens of usury and casinos, and the businessman in the Austrian sense of the word is nothing more than a stock market speculator or a small time chiseler. The Austrian press is nothing more than an extortion racket. Political life is calculated according to financial profit. In short, commercial life in Austria is permeated not by a Christian spirit but by a Jewish one. Economic life is dominated not by the Christian dedication of the individual to the common good, but is dominated instead by Jewish Egotism. The state has become nothing more than an agent of the powerful, oblivious to the fact that the Christian ideal demands the dedication of the individual to the common good and especially for the protection of the weak.[49]

The problem is not bad DNA; the problem is the Talmud, which is the ultimate source of all sharp Jewish business practices:

> The Jew displays in this regard an unbelievable ruthlessness so that in little transactions they begin to accumulate the capital that allows them to exploit others. It is in this ruthlessness and in their tireless pursuit of almost imperceptible profits wherein lies the secret of Jewish success in business,

> but it is also therein where the danger to which the Christian population is exposed when they sink to the same level. As soon as the Polish Jew gets his foot in the door, wages are driven down and working hours are extended. Once this happens the Christian masses find themselves as if by a force of nature driven from a state of modest prosperity into the deepest misery. The Polish Jew is so deeply enmired in the teaching of the Talmud that any notion of a Christian society or a state based on the common good becomes impossible once the Jew gains the upper hand. The Polish Jew, precisely because of the influence of the Talmud, is universally a force for corruption and destruction. Wherever one finds elements of dissatisfaction which threaten to overturn the Christian social order, Jews jump to the forefront of the movement and adopt the role of agitator. Jewish agitators can be found in leadership roles throughout the socialist movement. In Vienna and Pest, the leadership of the socialist movement is entirely in Jewish hands.

Implicit in Ratzinger's thinking is a chain of propositions which begins with a survey of the economic situation in Germany and Austria at the end of 19th century and ends with a radical redefinition of the problem. There are no technical, Enlightenment solutions to this problem. The technical thinking of the Enlightenment brought the problem about in the first place by striking down the laws which had been erected under the guidance of the Church for the protection of Christians and their culture.

The Emancipation of the Jews

The emancipation of the Jews dealt a fatal blow to the Christian social order. That is another way of saying that the social question (the exploitation of the worker, usury's appropriation of land, etc.) can only be solved by dealing with the Jewish question, which can only be solved by bringing about the conversion of the Jews, either completely through baptism, or formally by forcing their behavior to conform to Christian custom, as specified by *Sicut Iudeis non*. There is no point in dealing with an economic factor like state credit in isolation, especially

> when private persons determine the terms of credit. Jewish banks are now in the process of using state credit as a way of taking control of all industrial production. Herein lies the secret of the omnipotence of modern capitalist hegemony with all of its cancerous growth. Any social reform has to begin with the state establishing its independence from private equity firms as its source of credit. Only then will the source of all of capitalism's debilitating excesses be contained. To call anything else social reform is a waste of time.

It is pointless to talk about economics as if it were a science like physics when it is so closely bound up with the moral law. In order to deal with the crisis effectively, state authorities need to admit that:

> Seduction and crime are the main components of Jewish commerce. When the scions of wealthy families go astray, the easiest way to find the culprit responsible is to seek him among the Jews. The Jew supplies riding and wagon horses, equipage and dogs; he encourages the acting out of all base desires and the adoption of degenerate lifestyles; he is the fence and the pimp. Once he has established his influence over his rich young protégé, he encourages him to speculate on the stock market in order to win back the money he squandered on his vices. In this way the Jew brings about his complete ruin in a few years, which is when his fortune ends up in hands of his Jewish seducer. Anyone who is familiar with the realities of social life in Paris, Vienna, and Pest sees this sort of thing all the time. These seductive arts are closely allied with prostitution. Every aspect of trafficking in young females is firmly in Jewish hands and organized on an international basis. It's only a short step from this immoral trafficking to criminal activity. When it comes to embezzlement, misappropriation, fraud,

usury, blackmail, etc., the Jew is involved to a much greater percentage than the Christian.

Capitalism, which is another term for "Juedisches Erwerbsleben," or Jewish business practice has its roots in looting:

> In this way, Jewish business practices are similar to those of desert nomads who make use of their fleet horses of the steppes to conduct looting expeditions on settlements which pursue settled economic pursuits. In doing this they appropriate what they can drag off on their raids. They then live like kings off of "what they have earned" in the desert until the loot is all gone and another looting expedition is necessary. Jewish "commerce" has never been able to grow beyond its roots in looting. The majority of Jews has no idea of how to make a living from honest toil, nor do they want to learn how to do such a thing.[50]

> There are many forms of slavery that need to be abolished. What the Arab is to Africa, the usury Jew is to Europe. Both Semitic races live only off the exploitation of others, by looting. That is the revenant of the nomadic life of these tribes. Thousand years of living in the desert accustomed them to sudden attacks, and they learned through this booty off of the work of others. The entire Jewish-oriental way of doing business is deeply suffused with the characteristics of looting. One industry after another is singled out for looting, until finally whole nations have been plundered.[51]

Because of this, Jewish business practices are totally antithetical to the economy of a Christian culture, which is based on an understanding and appreciation of the value of work:

> In the instruction manuals from the Middle Ages, the people were taught that "Man is born to work, as the bird is created to fly." The Catholic Church raised the nations under her care to be workers and made earning by work the foundation of our civilization. There is only one way of earning a living which is worthy of respect and esteem, and that is earning a living by toil, whether that entails labor of a physical or an intellectual sort. It makes no difference whether this labor takes place on the lowest rung of the economic ladder among day-laborers or among the professions of the elite. In doing this the Church erected civilization upon an entirely new foundation. The pagan world proposed a life lived at the expense of others (slavery); Judaism preached preferential treatment for its own people, but permitted the exploitation and practicing usury on alien nations. And until

this day Jewish business practices exhibit this dual nature. On the one hand, we see concern for the family and for his fellow Jew, but on the other a totally heartless exploitation via usury of the goyim, which becomes the source of the wealth accumulated by Jewish billionaires. . . . The ancient principle of the Catholic Church, which only honors commerce when it is based on honest work, is drowned out by the Jewish screeching which encourages speculation and gambling on the stock market.[52]

By the last decade of the 19th century, it had become clear to thinkers like Georg Ratzinger that the laws enacted in the wake of the Enlightenment and its concomitant revolutions spelled economic disaster for Europe. The only solutions to the economic crisis was a return to Christian-inspired state regulation of the economy. "The Jews," Ratzinger opined,

must once again learn to subordinate themselves to Christian social reform and to conform their business practices to Christian norms. All of the money which they have earned through state-sanctioned usury and the exploitation of the worker must be returned to the people. The legislatures must now criminalize all of the fraud and exploitation which now has established itself under the rubric of free enterprise. The state needs to prosecute in a public manner all forms of usury and fraudulent exploitation. The current laws against usury and fraud are much too one-sided, and they do not correspond either to the experience or the plain sense of Christian jurisprudence.

There is no middle ground here; there are no neutral scientific laws. Either the Christian State must force Jews to acknowledge the superiority of their laws and conform to them, or, under the guise of tolerance and enlightenment, Christians will end up by becoming Jews via an unregulated, capitalist, Jewish economy:

Just think how contagious usury was then [during the middle ages] and how quickly public morality declined as a result. What germs are to epidemics, so is bad example on the moral level. It is irresponsible to give a free pass to contagious toxins by promoting a false view of life, unless you want the entire social organism to get sick. The disease of our culture consists in the cancerous spread of the Jewish-heathen worldview over the moral norms of Christendom. The inferiority of the Jewish-heathen worldview to Christianity must be made apparent, by the actions of the Christian state.

The solution to the social question can only come about when the Christian

idea of commerce has vanquished the Jewish-heathen idea. True protection of the social order is only possible in the confessional state. "Business practice must be made to conform once again to Christian morals":

> Intoxicated by revolution, Christian nations have pawned their most precious jewel -- the teaching and the grace of their savior—and have rejected their most precious asset, their character as redeemed children of the Lord, by abandoning the Christian basis for their culture. The Lord as a result has let the Christian nations go their own way, which has led to the debt bondage which flows from the obdurate hegemony of capital, which will end up concentrated in the hands of a small minority of Jews and their lackeys.

The Jews will also benefit from these reforms:

> Clear limits on Judaism in not only necessary for the interests of the Christian nations; it is also in the interest of the Jews themselves. Only when the sane principles of Christian reform have been put in place, can we hope to disarm the specter of anti-Semitic racial hatred. It is only then that we can hope to avoid the path of the violent taking the law into their own hands. Those who think that a small minority of Jews with the help of the power of the state can solve this problem, are deceiving themselves.

To put the case another way, if reform is not forthcoming, the Jews will be the first to suffer because:

The hegemony of social corruption has ended in every age in terror. This solution is no longer plausible. Either we are going to have Christian reform in our future or we are going to have the reign of racial hatred. The Jews should be under no illusions about what they can expect from the racial hatred that is waiting for them in the near future. Their arrogance is going to turn quickly into bitter disappointment in the future.

Especially Prophetic

Ratzinger was especially prophetic when he wrote in 1892:

> A reaction against the jewification of our culture is now building momentum among the common man. That movement is hardly perceptible today, but it is going to grow like an avalanche. That movement would be irresistible at this very moment if it weren't lacking a leader. (Ratzinger's word was, of course the German word "*Fuehrer*," which took on a whole new dimension some 40 years later.)

What he said of working class Christians in the 1890s is now true of Muslims in 2011:

> What the Christian earns by the sweat of his brow, the Jew lays hold of via usury, fraud, and cheating the worker out of a decent wage, and he squanders the money he appropriates in luxury and wretched excess. Confronted with these excesses, the moral consciousness of the working class finds itself consumed with rage, and since the government and the legislature provide no protection against the usurious and exploitative Jews and their lackeys, the people take to the streets. That is the meaning of anti-Semitism and the uproar it is now causing. We see in this a kind of economic self-defense and the moral defense mechanism of the exploited. It's a sign to the government and the legislature that the necessary legal protection isn't there, and a sign that the administration and the legal system aren't offering the assistance that they need to offer. Anti-Semitism is a serious and ultimate warning to the ruling class. If this warning is ignored, if the ruling class thinks that they deal with the people with bayonettes, then we are heading toward a revolution that is going to make the Reformation and the French revolution look like child's play by comparison.

Ratzinger is aware of the Darwinian notion that life involves struggle among individuals and ethnic groups as well. He simply takes that notion of struggle out of the biological realm and re-situations it n the moral cultural arena, as when he writes: "Any ethnic group which is totally lacking in moral restraint when it comes to economic life will end up the winner in any struggle for existence. This is the secret of Jewish success in Austria-Hungary."[53] Similarly, Ratzinger isn't denying that life is a struggle; he is simply unwilling to say, as the sociobiologists must, that the cause of the victors in cultural warfare is ipso facto just:

> The life of nations is like the life of individuals. He who fails to engage in battle daily to secure his position in society will soon disappear. The Catholics in Austro-Hungary have failed to engage in the daily battle for their possessions, and as a result they lose year after year one institution after another. They have been dispossessed from top to bottom, from their universities as well as their kindergartens. The Jews, who make up less than 10 percent of the population, have as a result of their energetic and unified and self-confident activity won a victory over the 90 percent of the population which is Catholic and have everywhere occupied the positions which the Catholics have abandoned.[54]

If survival of the fittest is the fundamental law of sociobiology, then Jews must be in fact the master race. Hitler got it almost right. Conversely, when it comes to the struggle for existence, white guys are losers; from the sociobiological perspective, the highest thing anyone can aspire to be is a Jew. Hence, David's delight when he found that he had Jewish DNA in his cells. He was now a member of the master race, which of course, was at the same time, the enemy of the entire human race. This leads him to the contradictory assertion "I'm a product of my times. I am my genes." What he means to say is that the upheaval in his life caused by the sexual revolution left him totally uprooted and without any sense of identity. Since he lives is a materialist scientistic culture, finding his roots took a biological turn, helped of course by the sociobiology he imbibed from the writings of Professor MacDonald. Talk about race is the ultimate sign of deracination.

If Georg Ratzinger's explanation of the rise of Jewish power is superior to Kevin MacDonald's, a different picture begins to emerge. David became a Jew not because he discovered superior DNA in his cells, but because the Catholic Church failed to preach the gospel. We are talking about failure on a massive scale here. In Georg Ratzinger's day when the Catholic confessional state was in power in places like Bavaria and the double monarchy of Austro-Hungary, Catholic elites refused to enforce the (largely economic) laws on the books which protected the weak in a Christian culture

Then came the Thirty Years War (1915-1945) which put the revolutionary elites in power after World War II By nineteen sixty farseeing church men like Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani saw that European Christian culture needed to strengthened against assaults from the Jewish elites in both the East and the West, as represented by Freudianism and Communism, Hollywood movies, fast food, rock n roll—in short, everything that Federico Fellini discussed in *La Dolce Vita,* the seminal 1960 document.

Instead of regaining the initiative, the Catholic Church used the council which Ottaviani persuaded Pope John XXIII to convoke as a way of internalizing the commands of her oppressors. The Church which used *Dignitatis Humanae* as a pretext to abandon the confessional state (even though the document affirms the opposite) and *Nostra Aetate* as a pretext to abandon its efforts to preach the Gospel to the Jews and work for their conversion, created a world in which Jews who recognized the synagogue's attack on logos and recoiled from it in disgust had no alternative but to become Jewish Nazis, because Hitler had succeeded Christ as the antithesis of what it meant to be a Jew. David Cooper and Danny Balint are infallible signs that the Church is not doing its job. Whenever a Jew recoils in disgust from the Nihilism which is the essence of the Jewish religion, his first thought should be, "This is what St. Paul meant when he said the Jews are 'the enemy of the entire human race.' This is what the Church has been saying all along."

The fact that this thought did not pop into David's mind is a sign that the Church has abandoned its mission of evangelization to the people who need it the most, the people to whom Christ preached exclusively when he walked this earth.

When pushed on the matter, David will admit, "In theory I was a Catholic. But they didn't tell me anything. My dad left Church" as a result of the divorce, and after that David's exposure to Catholicism was attending "the hippie Mass at St. John's" in the company of his sexually liberated mother. As part of his Catholic upbringing, David's mom told him that "the priest at St. John's is gay." The net result of this failure on the Church's part was deracination. David felt totally rootless, totally cut off from any familial or cultural or religious tradition. As a result, he began to see those roots in his DNA. Race would provide what David's church and family failed to give him.

"I wanted to know who I am. Race is not a social construct. Race and ethnicity is about biology." Then after discovering his Jewish DNA, David joined the synagogue, where he learned that "Judaism doesn't involve a relationship with God." Now after learning that the rabbi and most of his congregation are atheists, David is feeling spiritually restless again.

"Technically I'm a Jew," he says, "but my heart's not in it.

The logic here is not as convoluted as one might think. After being exposed to the full nihilism of the Jewish "faith," the Jew recoils in horror and disgust. At that point, he either devotes himself to some lesser god such as money or sex, or he recoils completely and looks for the opposite of what he learned in the synagogue. The Catholic Church is the true opposite of what gets taught in the synagogue, but the Church simply has not been proclaiming Church

teaching on the Jews for decades. As a result, in his search for the antithesis of everything Judaism stands for the Jew discovers the Nazis, whose racial beliefs are simply the mirror image of Judaism anyway, and the Jew becomes a Nazi.

By virtue of his baptism, David is a Catholic, something he admits in more candid moments, "I've been to Mass more times than I've been to the synagogue." Why then does he think he's a Jew? The initial answer to that question is Kevin MacDonald and DNA testing. The real answer to that question, however, lies in the massive failure of the contemporary Catholic Church either to live or proclaim the gospel. To begin with the living part, the priest he got to know best as a child was a regular guest at their house because he was having an affair with his mother.

> When I was 11 years old, my mom met and seduced a monsignor. The relationship lasted for as long as 20 years. Maybe more. I don't know when it ended. He died a few years ago. I don't know how much more I'll say about it, but I'd like for you to let it lie. Please don't poke around about it. Thank you. Of course, it takes two to tango. I couldn't exactly say who seduced whom. She wanted to marry him, and she says he talked about that as a possibility for many years. The whole thing disgusts me. Talk about sacrosanct and profane. I'll probably never forgive her for this, or some other transgressions.

The failure of the church to proclaim the gospel is not unrelated to moral failure. The contemporary Church's intellectual cowardice in proclaiming the Gospel teaching on the Jews simply puts its moral turpitude in sexual matters in the shade by comparison. Everything the contemporary Catholic Church has to say about the Jews is either insipid or flat out wrong and a contradiction of everything the gospels and the Church fathers had to say on the matter.

The Church has all but officially proclaimed that it is not interested in converting the Jews. The American bishops had proclaimed in their own catechism that the Mosaic covenant was eternally valid and that Jews could be saved by following it. That this was a heretical, flat out contradiction of the gospel finally dawned on the bishops and they deleted the offending statement.

Those organizations which do claim to be interested in the conversion of the Jews, turn out to be, upon closer inspection, the opposite of what they claim to be. The Association of Hebrew Catholics is a good case in point. Instead of working for the conversion of the Jews, the AHC works instead for the preservation of pockets of Jewish DNA within the Church. Instead of working to integrate Jewish converts into Church life, the AHC attempts to create Jewish ghettos based on what can only be construed as racial and therefore heretical

principles.

In the February 2006 issue of *Culture Wars*, Theologian Raymond Kevane, theological advisor to the AHC pointed out these heretical principles publically to David Moss, the organization's president, after years of trying to get an answer from him privately:

> Not too long ago (March 2005) in a public statement on EWTN, Dave Moss rejected the idea that the Church replaced the people of Israel. He clearly identified the latter idea as an "erroneous theology" that was taught for 2000 years by the Catholic Church. He further stated that the Church no longer teaches that he people of Israel are superseded. They are an eternal people with an irrevocable calling. How can any individual declare that the Catholic Church . . . . has taught erroneous theology for 2000 years.[55]
>
> Both statements are heretical. The most important "irrevocable calling" for the Jews is the same as for the rest of us—to save their immortal souls. In one stroke Dave Moss denied the Scripture as inspired by God, the infallibility of the Pope and Ecumenical councils and the fact of Tradition (the office of the Magisterium of the Catholic Church). No Catholic can say that the Church has held and erroneous theology for 2000 years and still remain a Catholic. [56]
>
> In almost every century there has been an effort to bring the rites of the Jewish religion into the Catholic Church. Every time it has arisen it has caused great harm to the Catholic Church before finally being discredited.

So when Dave Moss said that the Church was in theological error for 2000 years, he denies the infallibility of the pope and the councils of the Church

> The Council of Florence. . . firmly believes and profess, and teaches . . . that whoever, even after the passion , placed hope in these mattes of the law and submitted himself to them as necessary for salvation, as if faith in Christ could not save without them, sinned mortally. . . .

To reinstate, in the Catholic Church, any of the Judaic rituals of the Old Testament would be to suggest that the Sacrifice by Christ is not perfect.

It turns out that the AHC isn't interested in Jewish conversion at all:

> David Moss told me . . . that he doesn't believe that the AHC should be involved in "targeting" other Jews , but rather to simply "converse" or "dialogue" with them. But if that's true, then the converted Jew is not obeying the command of Christ "Go forth and preach the Gospel to all nations."

On August 5, 2010, David Moss, president of the Association of Hebrew Catholics, interviewed Archbishop Raymond L. Burke, who was then head of the Apostolic Signatura in Rome. Moss's tendentious questions were largely formulated in response to the objections which Raymond Kevane raised in his *Culture Wars* article but remained unanswered. In response to a question about the special role the "Hebrew" Catholic might play in the Church, Burke ignored the issue and thinking that he was agreeing with Moss claimed that "We [*i.e.*, Catholics] are the sons and daughters of Abraham, and we feel the closest bond to the Jewish people." Burke, of course, implies here that we feel this bond because the Jews can also construe themselves as children of Abraham, even though this assertion is contradicted by the Gospel of St. John, which states quite clearly that followers of Christ can call themselves children of Moses, but those who reject Christ, *i.e.*, the Jews, cannot. Burke then goes on to add:

> A Hebrew Catholic has a distinctive witness to give in the church. They are particularly cherished because of the rich heritage they bring to the church. Is his excellency referring to the Talmud here? If not, it's difficult to see what other heritage the Jew can bring to the church, since that rejection of logos is the heart of the Jewish religion.

Not Impressed

David wasn't impressed by this sort of outreach. In fact, he's hoping that the Church maintains its position as "a last bastion of anti-Semitism" because American Protestants in his view have been Judaized. The Catholic Church is a repudiation of Judaism, in David's view because Jesus Christ's teaching was a repudiation of the religion of that time and place. The Talmud is not based on the Hebrew Bible. They start with the Mishna, spoken word brought down from Mt. Sinai. From there it is only a short step to concluding as the rabbi did at Baruch Goldstein's funeral, that 10,000 Palestinian children aren't worth one Jewish fingernail.

David's experiences in the synagogue confirmed the nihilism which Danny Balint discovered at the heart of Judaism as a Yeshiva student:

"I've never met a Jew who believes in God," David opined. "My rabbi does not believe in God. None of the Jews in my congregation believes in God. I have yet to find a Jew who believes in a divine God."

It was this discovery of nihilism at the heart of Judaism which led David to conclude that "Jews make the best anti-Semites." It also led him to conclude that the greatest anti-Semite of all time, as well as one of the modern era's greatest nihilists, was Jewish.

"Hitler's dad's dad was Jewish," David said. "His dad's mom worked in a Jewish household and the man of the house impregnated her when she was around 40." It led Danny Balint to the same conclusion in *The Believer*, when he asks rhetorically, "So Hitler's the chief rabbi now?"

Danny is right. Hitler is the chief rabbi now. He attained that position by default when the Church stopped working for the conversion of the Jews.

* * *

Biographical Note

E. Michael Jones, the editor of Culture Wars magazine, is the author of more than a dozen books, which are available through the magazine's website. You may contact him at jones@culturewars.com.

Footnotes

---

[1] Dorothy Rabinowitz, "Major Hasan, 'Star Officer'" WSJ, 2/18/11

[2] http://www.kevinmacdonald.net/Immigration.pdf. All subsequent quotes on immigration have been taken from this article.

[3] Georg Ratzinger, *Juedisches Erwerbsleben: Skizzen aus dem sozialen Leben der Gegenwart* (Passau: Verlag von Rudolf Abt, 1892). p. 30. All translations from the German are mine.

[4] Wikipedia, Anton Graf von Arco auf Valley

[5] Erich Haberer, *Jews and revolution in Nineteenth-century Russia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), p. 14. The subsequent discussion of Jewish nihilism in 19th century Russia is taken from Haberer.

[6] Haberer, p. 15.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Haberer, p. 16.

[9] Haberer, p. 18.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Haberer, p. 24.

[12] Haberer, p. 43.

[13] Haberer, p. 117.

[14] Haberer, p. 120.

[15] Haberer, p. 175.

[16] Haberer, p. 189.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Haberer, p. 124.

[19] Haberer, p. 151.

[20] Haberer, p. 154.

[21] Haberer, pp. 155-6.

[22] Haberer, p. 159.

[23] Haberer, p. 201.

[24] Eugene (Fr. Seraphim) Rose, Nihilism: The Root of the Revolution of the Modern Age

[25] Samuel Roth, Jews Must Live: An Account of the Persecution of the World by Israel on all the Frontiers of Civilization (No place of publication, 1934), pp. 12-3.

[26] Roth, p.11.

[27] Roth, p. 17.

[28] I Thessalonians 2:15.

[29] Roth, p. 18.

[30] Roth, p. 20.

[31] David thinks the DNA testing business is rife with fraud, especially when it comes to Jewish ancestry.

[32] "Can the Jewish Model Help the West Survive?" Chapter 14 Cultural Insurrections: Essays on Western Civilisation, Jewish Influence and Anti-Semitism (Atlanta: Occidental Press 2007), pp. 355-6.

[33] Op. cit., p. 363.

[34] MacDonald gave this account of his life in a video documentary filmed by Byron Jost. Jost died before the video could be formally released. Segments are now on the internet.

[35] Robert Waldhausen (Georg Ratzinger) op. cit. The German Wikipedia page on Robert Waldhausen identifies him as Georg Ratzinger. Their explanation follows:

Georg Ratzinger werden aber auch die beiden nachfolgend genannten pseudonym veröffentlichten antisemitischen Hetzschriften zugeschrieben. Zwar kann Ratzingers Identität mit deren beiden Verfasserpseudonymen nicht anhand schriftlicher Zeugnisse belegt werden, jedoch gilt sie in der Forschung auf Grund von Indizien als gesichert und wird nicht in Frage gestellt. Unter dem Pseudonym "Dr. Robert Waldhausen" erschien 1892 das Buch *Jüdisches Erwerbsleben. Skizzen aus dem sozialen Leben der Gegenwart*, in dessen Einleitung es z. B. heißt: *Die Emanzipation der Juden […] konnte nicht anders, als zerstörend und zersetzend auf die ganze christliche Gesellschaft wirken.* Und 1897 wurde unter dem Pseudonym "Dr. Gottfried Wolf" ein antisemitisches Pamphlet mit dem Titel *Das Judentum in Bayern. Skizzen aus der Vergangenheit und Vorschläge für die Zukunft* publiziert. Auch in anderen, nicht pseudonym veröffentlichten Schriften Ratzingers, z. B. in *Die Volkswirthschaft in ihren sittlichen Grundlagen*, und in seinen Parlamentsreden lassen sich antisemitische Äußerungen und Tendenzen finden.

[36] Georg Ratzinger, op cit, pp. 1-2.

[37] Cf. E. Michael Jones, *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit* (South Bend, IN: Fidelity Press, 2009), pp. 676ff.

[38] Ratzinger, op. cit, p. 3.

[39] Georg Ratzinger, op cit., p. 5.

[40] Roth, op cit, p. 34.

[41] Joseph Kardinal Ratzinger, Salz der Erde: Christentum and katholische Kirch an der Jahrtausendwende (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1996), p. 47, my translation.

[42] Georg Ratzinger, op. cit., p. 84.

[43] Georg Ratzinger, op cit, p. 32.

[44] Georg Ratzinger, op. cit., p. 3.

[45] Georg Ratzinger, op cit, p. 4. My translation.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Georg Ratzinger, op. cit., p. 18.

[48] Georg Ratzinger, op. cit., p. 11.

[49] Georg Ratzinger, op. cit., p. 12.

[50] Georg Ratzinger, op.cit, p. 29

[51] Georg Ratzinger, op.cit.,p. 58

[52] Georg Ratzinger, op. cit., p. 38.

[53] Georg Ratzinger, op. cit, p. 53.

[54] Georg Ratzinger, op, cit., p. 49.

[55] Raymond Kevane, "An Open Letter to the Hebrew Catholic Conference," *Culture Wars*, February 2006, p. 9.

[56] Ibid.